

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

Deane
Cuph d.

CONTENTS

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH. PAGE

HATCHER, ANNA GRANVILLE.—To Get/Be Invited,	433
DEIERKAUF-HOLSBOER, S. WILMA.—Trois Querelles et leurs renseignements pour l'histoire du théâtre français au XVII ^e siècle,	440
BOWERS, R. H.—Middle-English Poems by Mydwynter,	454
BEALL, C. B.—A Quaint Conceit from Guarini to Dryden,	461
SCHUTZ, A. H.—Old Provençal "nozol,"	468
SCHWEITZER, J. W.—Georges de Scudéry and Antoine Godeau,	471
PITOU, SPIRE.—Richelet, Forerunner of Samuel Johnson, and de Lormes,	474
CROCKER, L. G.—A Note on Diderot and Patriotism,	476
ALLEN, D. C.—John Donne and the Tower of Babel,	481
JUERGENSEN, HANS.—Die Mutter in Adalbert Stifters Werken,	483
STURTEVANT, A. M.—Etymologies of Old Norse Proper Names Used as Poetic Designations,	490
SELMER, CARL.—An Unnoticed Middle Bavarian Prose Version of Pseudo-Aristotelian Proverbs,	491
FORCHHEIMER, PAUL.—'Klar wie Klössbrüh,'	493
REVIEWS:—	
SOLOMON LIPSTEIN, Germany's Stepchildren. [Harry Steinhauer.]	494
HARRY SLOCHOWER, No Voice Is Wholly Lost. [Harry Steinhauer.]	497
DONALD W. LEE, Functional Change in Early English. [Stefán Finarason.]	498
R. M. LUMIANSKY (tr.), <i>The Canterbury Tales</i> of Geoffrey Chaucer. Preface by Mark Van Doren. [H. R. Patch.]	500
BRIEF MENTION: CARL SEELIG (ed.), Georg Büchner, <i>Gesammelte Werke</i> ; <i>The World of Learning</i> ,	501
CORRESPONDENCE: Kanke(r)dort 'A State of Suspense, a Difficult Position'; Reply to Professor Orsini,	502

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMAYER
KEMP MALONE

CHARLES R. ANDERSON
DON CAMERON ALLEN

Advisory Editors

E. Feise, Grace Frank, J. C. French, R. D. Havens, E. Malakis, R. B. Roulston,
Pedro Salinas, Arno Schirokauer, L. Spitzer

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$5.00
for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other countries
included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 18, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are not used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, not vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNB*, *JEGP*, *MLN*, *MLR*, *MP*, *NED*, *PMLA*, *PQ*, *RR*, *SP*, *RES*, *TLS*. Proof and MS. should be returned to the editors with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Maryland.



From the research of 12 years

FUNK & WAGNALLS

STANDARD DICTIONARY

OF FOLKLORE MYTHOLOGY AND LEGEND

Edited by MARIA LEACH

Volume I
covers these cultures

African and	Estonian
New World Negro	European
American	Finnish
Australian	French
Basque	Germanic
Celtic	Indian and
Cheremissian	Persian
Chinese	Indonesian

FOR THE first time, the folklore, mythology, and legend of the world is gathered in one major, overall survey. No other one book contains the richness and range of the world's ancient and contemporary folklores: beliefs and practices, demons, gods, and "little people," dances, rimes, and stories. Articles and definitions by 30 of the world's foremost folklorists. Vol. I (A through I) Vol. II will appear in 1950.

544 pages, 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ x 10 $\frac{1}{4}$. \$7.50 at bookstores.

FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY, 153 East 24th Street, New York 10, N. Y.

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

rs
ne
ot
es
ne
of
o-
of
e,
ra
as

=

Modern Language Notes

Volume LXIV

NOVEMBER, 1949

Number 7

TO GET / BE INVITED

That the passive construction with *get*¹ has, today, no special nuance of its own (except, perhaps, its colloquial flavor) to distinguish it from that with *be*, is apparently taken for granted by most

¹ According to the *NED*, the use of *get* as passive auxiliary is to be explained as an extension of its use with adjectives (and adjectival participles): *to get free*, *to get drunk*. And the type *to get free* is explained, in turn, from the use of intransitive *get* as a verb of movement (*to get away*, *to get to the shore*—which last, perhaps, goes back to the use of transitive *get* as a verb of movement: cf. the obsolete *to get the shore*).

It is of course the third stage which distinguishes *get* from other copulas of 'becoming' (*turn*, *go*, *grow*, *was*—and, for the most part, the verb *become* itself: see below). But what is the difference between an adjectival participle and one with true verbal force—in our case, with true *passive* verbal force? There are, perhaps, two criteria of distinction: on the one hand, we have the type (of emotional reaction): *he got upset*, *he got irritated* etc., where the participle refers clearly to the effect of a passive action (one must be upset, irritated, *by* something or someone, before one can "get upset, irritated"); but, since we are apt to be more interested in the emotional condition reached by the subject than in the activity of the agent productive of this condition, such participles may be felt as adjectives (in contrast to *he got paid*, *he got fired*)—and usually are, unless we are forced by the context to concentrate on the agent's activity (*she was continually being annoyed by . . .*), in which case *get* will hardly be found. We may also consider the participle *accustomed* as an adjective in *he got accustomed to . . .*, for we are seldom interested in "what has accustomed" a person: the type: "he was accustomed *by hard work* to expect . . ." is the exception.

On the other hand, there are many cases in which the so-called passive participles with *get* (or *be*) reflect no passive action whatsoever. This is obviously true of: *he got drunk*, *finished*, *caught up with his work*; *he got used to . . .*, where the participle describes the result of the subject's own (transitive or intransitive) activity. Again, the participle may point back to activity performed by the subject upon himself: we have regularly to do with reflexive activity in *she got fixed up*, *he got dressed*, *shaved* (for

grammarians.^{1a} The only distinction made by Jespersen (*MEG*, iv, 108-12) and Curme (*Syntax*, 446) is that between state and action: *be* + participle may, obviously, refer either to a "Statal Passive" (*the house is painted*) or an "Actional Passive" (*the house is painted every year*: to use the terms and examples of Curme), but *get*, because of its ingressive aspect must be limited exclusively to the latter²—and, accordingly, represents a convenient device to avoid ambiguity.

The two grammarians differ somewhat in their opinion as to the necessity of this device. Curme would seem to suggest that the

the passive idea, the expression *to get a shave* is preferred); *they got settled*; *he got lost*. Since these types could never (or rarely) be paraphrased by "someone dressed, shaved, settled, lost him," I should say that it is not correct to speak here of *get* as a passive auxiliary.

Finally, there are some participles which refer to an activity for which a verb no longer exists: in *he got acquainted*, the participle comes from an obsolete intransitive 'to acquaint with another'; in *she got engaged*, from an obsolete (or obsolescent) reflexive 'to engage oneself to another.' But never in their history have these two participles been used to refer to the passive action of *'being acquainted by s.o.' or *'being engaged [to marry] by s.o.' (As for *to get married*, see note 13).

Are, then, such participles as the last three types to be considered as adjectives? Until a third category is invented, I see no other way. And since the use of *get* with true passive participles is paralleled by no other auxiliary, except *be* (see note 13), the real nature of this verb is obscured if we include such examples as *he got finished*, *lost*, *acquainted* together with *he got paid* = 'some one paid him' and *he got fired* = 'someone fired him.' (The *NED*, however, lists *get acquainted* as the first attestation of "*get* + p.p.," in which category it also includes *he got used to* . . . [though *he got drunk* is (rightly) listed under 'adjectival complement']; Jespersen, in addition to *get acquainted*, includes also *to get engaged*, *accustomed*—and even *he got finished*!)

^{1a} That a stylistic difference does exist between *be* and *get* is recognized, to some extent, by Mildred E. Lambert, in a brief comment included in one of her studies on predication ("Studies in Stylistics," iv, *American Speech*, iv [1929], p. 143); but her remarks are too summary and vague to offer more than a hint of the possibilities of *get*. She speaks of "forcefulness," "vitality," "emphasis" [emphasis on what?]; she states that some of the original meaning of 'acquiring or receiving' still continues in the auxiliary *get* (without seeking to show how this may influence the concept of a passive action)—and, of course, mentions the limitation to ingressive aspect insisted upon exclusively, and unduly, by Curme and Jespersen (see below).

² These same grammarians might also have noted that, because of its ingressive aspect, *get* is impossible in reference not only to state but also to durative action: one would never say: "he got watched, followed, liked, etc."

construction with *be* is inevitably ambiguous—or, rather, that it has an inherent reference to state, a congenital inability to insist on action.³ But this means that he disregards completely (or else, wrongly interprets) such constructions as: *the man was run over, introduced, arrested, fired, put in jail, elected*—where a static interpretation is impossible. When, in such statements, *be* is replaced by *get*, there has been not the slightest heightening of emphasis on activity—so that we must suppose that the substitution in question has been “unnecessary,” and quite meaningless. We are also invited to suppose (by Jespersen) that this, often meaningless, substitution is freely available: that *get* (except in the most formal style) may be used at will to replace *be* as passive auxiliary, so long as there is no reference to state (or durative action).

But it should be obvious that this is not the case. We will find “he *got* fired” but “he *was* fired by the superintendent”; “he *got* run over,” but “he *was* run over in cold blood”; “he *got* arrested,” but “he *was* arrested on false charges” (or “he *was* arrested the next morning in his house”); “she *got* introduced to General Eisenhower” but “she *was* then introduced to the guests”; “ever since he *got* elected, he’s been stuck-up” but “ever since he *was* elected, things have gone much better.” Nor can one easily imagine, in any context, the replacement of *be* by *get* in such statements as “he was tried, approached, slandered, announced, hindered.” As a matter of fact, the use of *get* as passive auxiliary is greatly limited (I have been able to go through a half-dozen modern plays without finding a single example); and, when it is used, we may be sure that it has a nuance of its own much more significant than its obvious (and usually unnecessary) emphasis on ingressive aspect. In order to determine what this nuance is we must, of course, seek to analyze the nature of the restrictions on its use.

The most clear-cut limitation is seen in the difficulty of adding

³ This was, of course, once true of the verb *be*: in order to express the idea of an “actional passive,” the ingressive *weorthan* was necessary. And Curme, who compares modern *get* with the OE *weorthan*—and who even seems to see in the former a mystical rebirth of the latter—is thinking in terms of a system which no longer exists. For, along with the disappearance of *weorthan*, the static *be* grew steadily in ingressive force—to the extent, indeed, that, in the case of many verbs, a static interpretation has become absolutely impossible (who would say, today: **the tables are removed, *the man is run over?*). Curme’s attempted distinction would only put back the clock by many centuries.

the preposition *by* + name of [human] agent: "he got fired by the superintendent" is hardly possible.⁴ And this formal limitation must be indicative of a restriction to a particular type of passive action: since, when *get* is used as auxiliary, the agent of the passive action is rarely named as such, this must mean that his rôle in this action is subordinated: that the agent does not completely dominate the situation—the subject, himself, having a chance to modify or determine, in some way or to some degree, what happens to him.

This is obviously the case in such examples as: "Well, I think I'll go get examined," "have you gotten vaccinated yet?" where the subject himself (usually) initiates the activity, using the agent as a means to his own ends. This use of *get*, however, is rare:⁵ the usual type (with which this article is mainly concerned) is that represented by *he got invited* or *he got run over*, where there is no suggestion whatsoever that the subject has deliberately induced an agent to act upon him; indeed, in the second example, the passive action is one which a person in his right senses would surely never

⁴ It is of course quite possible to say "he got hit on the head *with* a stone" and even "he got kicked *by* a mule, bitten *by* a snake, run over *by* an automobile." As for reference to a human agent, I would say that this depends somewhat on the degree to which this agent is individualized: "he got run over by a drunken driver" might be said, but hardly "he got run over by the man next door." In the first case, with indefinite article, the agent is suddenly created, out of thin air, as it were, so that his tenuous existence may be tolerated. (Jespersen, however, quotes from Dickens the example: "he got killed by the other four.")

⁵ I should say that it is limited to cases (like the two just cited) in which the activity of the (unnamed) agent is of a routine, professional nature. Otherwise, in reference to passive activity initiated by the subject, we will find a reflexive construction: either *to have oneself . . . ed* (*he had himself paged, he had himself let out the back way*—one could also say: *he had himself examined*) or *to get oneself . . . ed* (*he got himself elected, he got himself invited*). In the case of *get* + reflexive, there is regularly a facetious or pejorative nuance, as if to imply that the subject has used questionable means to induce the final passive action. This is no doubt due to the more energetic force of *get*—which presents the subject as a "go-getter." In the two 18th-century examples of this construction cited by the *NED* there is reflected rather amusement or condescending pity at the effort expended by the subject [the first of these representing probably a reflexive rather than a passive situation]: "La Fleur had got himself so gallantly arrayed, I scarce knew him" (Stern, 1768); "Poor Barty . . . had applied, and got himself appointed a writer to the East India Company" (1779).

seek to provoke—and this is by far the more frequent context in which *get* as passive auxiliary is found:

He got left behind, locked out
 he got stepped on, knocked down, hurt, shot, killed, beaten up,
 hit over the head
 he got fooled, gypped, cheated
 he got caught, found out, arrested, punished, called down, fined,
 kept in, fired; blamed

Here, where the action undergone by the subject is of such an undesirable nature, it may seem difficult to grant him any degree of freedom to "modify or determine" what has happened to him.

It may be said, however, that if a person finds himself in any of the predicaments listed above, it is apt to be the result, to some degree, of his carelessness (if not of actual misbehavior); and we tend to feel that such accidents might have been avoided, with greater foresight or virtue on the part of the subject. This is much more evident in e.g. *he got fired* than in *he got run over*,⁶ *he got held up*; but, even here, there is at least a vague suggestion of the subject's responsibility, of his "potential" ability to have prevented such a situation,—for, if we attempt to imagine the exceptional cases in which the subject is meant to be entirely absolved, *get* will not be used: surely, it would be impossible to say "he got run over in cold blood"—or "he got fired unjustly," "he got arrested on false charges." Somewhat similarly, we will find "she got talked about" (as the result of indiscreet, if innocent behavior) but only "she *was*, *has been* slandered"; "he got held up in his work" but only "he *was* hindered from working": with *slandered* and *hindered*, the subject is presented as a helpless victim of mischievous activity. And, given this suggestion of inevitability, *get* would not be fitting.⁷

⁶ In *he got run over* (and also in *he got locked out*, *left behind*, *he got stepped on*) the activity of the agent has (usually) been committed without deliberate intent. But, the majority of cases are of the type *he got fired*, *beaten up* etc., where the agent acts deliberately (and, still, is not presented as completely controlling the fate of the subject).

⁷ This is not to say that the type *he got run over* is meant to suggest conspicuous carelessness on the part of the subject: it is not intended as a positive statement of a given individual's responsibility in a given situation—only as a vague suggestion of the "generic," the theoretical responsibility which rests on all victims of accidents.

For the more pointed suggestion of responsibility, one may find the reflexive construction with *get*: "So you got yourself kicked out!" "Be

Again, it would be impossible to use this auxiliary in such a context as: "he was starting to cross the street when two masked men came out of the alley toward him: he *was* held up and robbed of fifty dollars" or: "as she dashed out into the street after her ball, a car suddenly turned the corner: the child *was* immediately run over." We have said that such misfortunes as "getting run over" etc. are usually thought of as avoidable; but this is apt to be true only when they are referred to without context: when the happening is presented either as hypothetical ("look out, or you'll get . . .") or as something for which the listener is unprepared ("Have you heard about John? He just got . . ."). Obviously, something which has not yet happened may be considered unavoidable; and the same may be true of a past event which is abstracted from the particular situation out of which it grew. Generally speaking, the average citizen has many chances, according to statistics, not to get run over, held up or arrested. But, at the moment the thugs accost him, the automobile turns the corner (or the policeman claps him on the shoulder), the law of averages does him no good: fitted within its context, the "accident" appears as inevitable (and *get* may not be used).⁸ In the sentence, "did you hear that Tom got held up last night?", it is "Tom in general," the perennial Tom (the Tom who has a chance *not* to be held up) who is presented to us: Tom apart from any situation of the moment

careful or you'll get yourself killed!" Now this reflexive construction was, obviously, intended originally to refer to deliberate purposeful action, and may still be so used (for example, *to get oneself killed* may also refer to an act prompted by suicidal motives—as in Maxwell Anderson's *Storm Operation*: "Simeon's dead. He never wanted to come back down that hill. I knew when we started up. *He didn't get himself killed*, mind you. It just happened": *Best Plays of 1943-44*, p. 310). And, precisely because of this strong original emphasis on the initiative of the subject, the extension to an 'accidental' reference must be considered as due to heavy irony: "So you worked hard to get yourself kicked out: you succeeded in getting yourself kicked out!" or "(if you keep on that way) you'll do a fine job of getting yourself killed!" (cf. also Fr., "vous allez vous faire tuer!"). Thus, in the type "so, you got yourself kicked out!" the driving force of the go-getter ("he got himself elected") has proved a boomerang.

* In this connection we may be reminded of the restriction attendant upon the use of the reflexive in French, in reference to a predicament which the subject has accidentally brought upon himself: one may say of a child who has been hurt by his comrades in a game "*il s'est blessé*"; but one could use only *il fut blessé* in reference to the actual moment at which he was hurt.

(and this is the way we ordinarily think of individuals, unless we are forced to do otherwise by the context or the situation). To this Tom, we are always ready to allow a certain leeway: by this autonomous, timeless person, thought of in terms of his career as a whole, any particular incident might have been avoided. But Tom-at-a-given-moment, is another kind of being; and whatever happens to him had to happen—according to laws quite unrelated to his being.

Now, it might be said that in the two examples just cited, the agent (masked men, automobile) has been referred to (though only as agent-to-be), and that it is for this reason that *get* is impossible. But I would say that the real agent is the actual situation: the subject of the passive verb is dominated by the "moment" as well as by the so-called agents. At any rate, it is true that *get* may never be used *when the passive action is inserted into the flow of events*—even when no agent is seen lurking in the wings: "for the next few days he stayed with friends and managed to escape detection; the third night, he went back to his family; and the next morning early he was arrested in his home." It is difficult to imagine: "... *the next morning* he got arrested"; once caught within the flow of events, the person in question can be seen only as a "passive" target. But, in "Mrs. Jones is nearly distracted; her boy Tom got arrested today for stealing apples," the subject, Tom, is presented as a free agent (until the moment of his arrest), who has met with an "accident": to us, who see him outside of any immediate context, his arrest has seemed to come out of the blue sky, instead of forming a part of the inexorable march of events (conditioned by timing). Mrs. Jones' boy, Tom, that consistent entity, had any number of chances not to be arrested—or so we optimistically suppose, since we have not seen the situation "closing in" on him.

This does not mean that *get* is never found within a sequence, or that it may never be introduced by any preamble. It is true that it is most often found, without context: either in hypothetical or indefinite references ("don't get . . . ed," "you'll get . . . ed," "I always get . . . ed"), or in sudden, unprepared announcements which give the gist, the climax of an event: which serve to offer "news" rather than narrative ("Have you heard about Tom? He got . . . ed"). But one could well imagine such a presentation as: "Tom's always been a problem; his mother didn't know how to

manage him: all she could think of was holding back his allowance. But then he started taking things: chocolate bars, comics. A few times, she made good the loss, and nothing happened; but finally *he got arrested* and sent to the detention home."

But this is a summary, not a narrative: it is retrospective, whereas a narrative, having carried us back to a certain point in time, allows us to watch, from this point, the events move *forward* to a certain situation—which has not already happened. But, in the summary just offered, it is taken for granted that Tom's arrest has already happened (indeed, it may even be taken for granted that this incident is already known to the audience, who are interested only in an explanation): the speaker, remaining comfortably in the present, looks over his shoulder at the past: he does not, as a narrator would do, reinsert the happening into a sequence of events in time: "In the next few weeks, Tom became bolder; encouraged by the success of his petty crimes, he decided, at last, to break in the door of the confectionery store, next door. But he had reckoned without the burglar alarm; and he *was arrested* while he was in the midst of filling his pockets. This time he was sentenced to the detention home." Here, the subject's arrest and conviction are a part of the network of events in time, against which he is helpless.

The same general limitations obtain when the construction with *get* is used to refer to a fortunate incident in the career of an individual (where, of course, one would hardly think in terms of "coercion by an agent"): the event must seem, in some way, to some degree, the result of chance (*to get elected, nominated, invited, promoted; to get waited on, served; to get paid*),⁹ and it must be presented free from the context of a given situation in time. Thus one may say "Oh, I never *get invited* anywhere!", or "Susie *got invited* to the President's tea, did you?", or even (in a summary): "It looked as if I would never get a chance to wear my new evening

⁹ Of this list, it is perhaps the verb *to get paid* which would seem to have the least reference to chance. It may, however, quite easily be a matter of chance just when one gets paid ("we get paid on Tuesday") or how ("we get paid in cash") or how much ("we got paid in full").

It is also true that in *to get waited on, served*, the subject himself has initiated the passive activity, much as in the type *to get examined*. But I should say, given present-day conditions, that such a fortunate outcome as that of *getting waited on, served* is considered mainly as good luck—the subject being able only to request, to put himself in line for, this service.

dress; nobody asked me out anywhere for weeks; but, just as I was beginning to give up hope, I *got invited* to this dinner." But *get* would not be used in such a narrative sequence as "when her shopping was done, she dropped in at the Smith's. There were several interesting couples there, one of whom took a great liking to her, and she *was invited* to their house for the weekend."

Now it should be noted that *get* will be used only for the two types of events just treated: those felt as having either fortunate or unfortunate consequences for the subject. This construction would be utterly impossible in such non-affective statements as "he was seen [working in the garden]," "they were considered [good friends]," or "she was described [as a hard-working person]." Nor would one normally say: "she got sent to school [when she was six]," "he got trained [as a mechanic]," "he got buried [in the family graveyard]," "he got born [in New York]," or "she got introduced [to the hostess]." However, in a different context, perhaps all of these constructions might be possible: e.g. "He has all the luck: he *gets sent* to a private school" or "babies don't *get born* with silver spoons in their mouths any more" or "she *got introduced* to General Eisenhower."¹⁰

This emphasis on good or bad fortune means, of course, that in the construction with *get*, the passive action is presented from the point of view of the subject: it is considered only as something (good or bad) happening to him, a stage in his private career.¹¹ I may say of my friend: "Susie got invited to the Smith's": for me, at that moment, the desires and decisions of the hosts, and all the machinery of their social planning do not exist—at least, not independently: an invitation is something which one receives or does not, and which exists only for the recipient. But, to the hosts themselves, a guest who is (or is not) invited is seen as playing a part in their own plans; and Mr. Smith himself could never ask his

¹⁰ An additional reason for not finding *get* in the anodyne situation of 'being presented to one's hostess,' is that the reference to such an event would not be found outside of continuous narrative ("she was *then* presented . . .")—whereas the rest of the factual statements listed above could appear as independent statements, and are restricted to the auxiliary *be* only because of the absence of emotion.

¹¹ It is also for this reason that we are not apt to find *get* used in connection with explanatory details: "he got arrested *in his home*"; to a person interested only in the career of the subject, the place of his arrest would be unimportant—at least, when the news is first received.

wife: "Did Susie Brown get invited [to our party]?" Or again, we may compare the two sentences quoted at the beginning: "ever since he *got* elected Class President, he's been stuck-up" with "ever since he *was* elected Class President, things have been running much more smoothly." In the one case, the election is seen as a personal triumph for the subject; in the second, as an event which affects the interests of the community.

To sum up, then: the construction with *get* is used only when the subject is presented as free from the coercion of others, free from the timing of events: an autonomous (though vulnerable) being, moving within his personal orbit; and it is used only when the passive act represents a happening (an "adventure") which has meaning within this orbit alone. For that reason, this construction is not suited to narrative, where every character is seen at a given moment, and against the impersonal background of outer reality, with its own irrevocable laws. With *get*, each individual lives in his private universe: only two things exist: the subject and the event—which, by a kind of magnetism, is attracted into the latter's sphere.¹² It might be said that our construction is an (auto-) biographical device, which serves to record the experiences of individuals in whom Fate, whether she smiles or frowns, is personally interested.

* * * * *

How are we to explain the peculiar nuance of the passive auxiliary *get* in modern English? How, indeed, may we explain that it is used at all as passive auxiliary? That this use may represent the result of the semantic development from 'arrive' to 'become,' as the *NED* suggests, is no real answer to the problem, for the verb *become* itself underwent the same shift of meaning, and yet has never been able to serve as a true passive auxiliary (no more than have *grow*, *wax*, *turn*, *go*, etc.).¹³

¹² The construction with *get* represents a variation of the passive which may, perhaps, be compared to the variation of the *active* offered by the Greek Middle: in both, the act is interpreted in terms of its significance for the subject.

¹³ Jespersen lists *become* (and even *grow*, *stand*, *rest*) along with *get* as a passive auxiliary—without, of course, attempting to define the restrictions on its use. These restrictions are such, in my opinion, as absolutely to exclude it from consideration as a passive auxiliary: for *become* may never be used to refer to any *passive action performed by a human agent* (unless, of course, the participle is such as to invite an adjectival interpre-

The reason is to be sought in the original force of the transitive verb *get*, which is defined by the *NED* as "to obtain possession of . . . as the result of effort or contrivance" (attested from 1200 on). Now it is true that this meaning soon weakened to that of 'receive'; in such expressions as (1300) *to get a service, to get one's sight*, the good fortune of the subject is presented not as his own achievement but as something granted him by the kindness of another or of Fate.¹⁴ And, once this emphasis on the "effort or contrivance" of the subject weakens, and he is presented as a mere recipient, we find the third stage of development, in which he appears as the recipient

tation: "this tradition became accepted" but not "the present became accepted"): never could one say *"he became invited, paid, waited on; *he became fired, run over, arrested, punished" (even "She became married" seems not to be possible—which proves, perhaps, that in *she got married*, the participle is not to be interpreted adjectively [*she got engaged*], but in line with *she got invited*). Of the several dozens of examples with *get* listed above in the text, not one would tolerate the use of *become*. It is true that I have excluded from consideration such borderline cases as *he got accustomed, drunk, lost, engaged*, and here we may indeed find *become* alternating with *get*. But, unlike *get*, *become* is found only in border-line cases.

And it is perhaps because Jespersen insisted in treating *get* along with *become* and other ingressive auxiliaries that he was unable to find the particular nuance of this verb; though he did not go so far as Curme in his insistence on action vs. state, still it was this distinction (copulas of being vs. copulas of becoming) which was alone important to him. Because of this, he had to see *get* and *become* as "belonging together," and was blind to the important differences which separated them. These differences are of two sorts: in the first place, there is the distinction between passive (*get*) and semi-passive (*become*)—a general distinction which, of course, involves still other possibilities of alternation (*the tree was shaken* vs. *the tree shook*) and to which Jespersen has accorded only slight attention in his grammar. In the second place, there is a difference which has nothing to do with general grammatical categories, and which is to be seen only by studying the meaning of the verbs treated as individual words (and what a word is *get*!). In syntax, too, "every word has its own history"; it is only secondarily that *get* has become a part of the verbal system. Grammarians are apt to look only for paradigms; but once they pin the butterfly into their grammatical frame, all life stops.

¹⁴ There are, of course, intermediary stages between the idea of "obtaining as the result of effort" and that of merely receiving: for example, when one "gets" a (certain) salary, or a price for one's goods, both ideas are inextricably blended, and it may depend on the context which of the two is stressed the more (here, we may be reminded of the in-between stages with *get* as auxiliary: *to get waited on* etc.).

of something undesirable, forced on him by the ill-will of another, or of Fate: *to get a fall* (1375), *to get a shove* (1475).

But, for all this "optional" weakening, transitive *get* never lost its original force. And it is this force that we always find (at the beginning) in the different uses which the verb has developed in the last seven centuries or more. When first used intransitively, as a verb of movement, *get* meant actually: "to *succeed in coming or going*; to bring oneself to, from etc. . . .": *get away*, *get out* (1300); "Thei han gotten on hem the lengthe of a gleyue" (1375). When, almost three centuries later, we find intransitive *get* used with predicative adjectives, it is, again, with the same insistence on the "effort or contrivance" of the subject: *to get clear of . . . debts* (1596), *to get loose from . . . enemies* (1659). The same is true of its use with adjectival participles, which we find by the 17th century: "They were both gotten sufficiently drunk" (1662), "a certain Spanish pretending Alchymist got acquainted with foure rich Spanish merchants" (1652). We may note the presence of *sufficiently* in the first sentence, which presents the intoxication of the subject as an achievement; as for the second, it is easy to surmise that the "pretender" who got acquainted with four "rich" merchants had engineered this meeting. If, then, *get* began to alternate with *become* in such expressions as *to get clear*, *to get drunk*, *acquainted*, this must have been because of its suggestion of achievement—of which the other verb was incapable.

Now, it might seem that this very emphasis would preclude the use of *get* as a passive auxiliary—the idea of 'personal achievement' being at the opposite pole from that of being acted upon by an agent. To the contrary, it appears as if the very driving force of *get* was able, as it were, to swing the agent into its orbit: to subordinate him to the rôle of acting in the subject's interest. For, the original meaning of *get* as passive auxiliary is not that of submitting to an agent, but of using an agent (as in the examples offered at the beginning: *to get examined*, *vaccinated*): the first definition offered by the *NED* is: "to cause or procure oneself to be treated in a certain way. . . ." ¹⁵

¹⁵ It must be admitted that the examples of the *NED* do not illustrate this meaning as clearly as might be desired: the first, *to get acquainted* (1653), must be rejected (as has already been pointed out), since it does not represent a passive construction; the next two examples may be interpreted in accord with the definition of the *NED*: *to get moored* (1793),

But, here, too, the emphasis on the initiative of the subject had to weaken, and to undergo the same development noted above with the original construction, transitive *get* + object: i.e. (1) to obtain (something desired) by one's own efforts; (2) to receive something desired or desirable through the good-offices of another (or of Fate); (3) to receive something undesirable through the bad offices of another (or of Fate). These three stages are clearly in evidence in the examples of the type *get* + adjective, listed by the *NED*: 1. *to get clear* (1596); 2. *to get better* (1776); 3. *to get lame* (1810). And we must similarly assume that, in the construction with passive participle, the order of development has been from the type *get examined* to *get invited* to *get fired*.¹⁶ Once the agent

to get supplied (1814)—though reflexive interpretation is not excluded. We have obviously to do with a passive expression, however, in the first quotation given by Jespersen (from Fielding): "You may not only save your life, but *get rewarded* for your roguery"—and, very probably, with an emphasis on "the effort or contrivance of the subject."

¹⁶ Would it not be possible, instead, to imagine a development from the original meaning "to obtain as the result of effort or contrivance" to the 'hard luck' type, *to get fired* (by way of irony), just as we have assumed this development for the reflexive type (*to get oneself invited* > *to get oneself kicked out*)? My main reason against such an assumption is the fact that one would then have to derive the 'good-luck' type *to get invited* from *to get fired*—a semantic development difficult to imagine (in the case of the reflexive construction, no such 'good-luck' type exists: *to get oneself promoted* could only suggest 'effort or contrivance').—Accordingly, it seems more reasonable to assume that *get*, as passive auxiliary, has simply reflected the three-fold development already undergone by the verb in other references.

But there is also a fourth stage of which nothing so far has been said: the use of *get* in reference to an inanimate object. Here, it may be stated briefly, that *get*, as auxiliary, will again refer only to good or bad fortune—though it will obviously not be the fortune of the (inanimate) subject itself that is in question: *the glass got broken*, *the purse got lost*; *the grass [finally] got cut*, *the packages [finally] got delivered*. In the first type, *get* usually (but not always: *my purse got stolen*) insists on the accidental nature of the injury or loss (i.e. accidental from the point of view of the *agent*): in the second, quite the reverse, there is usually suggested painful effort on the part of the agent.

Indeed, it is possible that the second type is not to be derived from the use of intransitive *get* with animate subject—but is to be explained from the type with transitive *get*: *we finally got the grass cut* > *the grass finally got cut*; *we finally got the packages delivered* > *the packages finally got delivered*; *we don't get anything done around here* > *nothing gets done around here*: that is, the transitive verb is made intransitive, to refer to

has been admitted (at first, as a means to the subject's own ends), he tends to take over the initiative himself—often with disastrous results for the subject.

But still, this agent (who can never be mentioned) is not allowed to overshadow the subject, though he may bring him to grief. He can still, somehow, only play into his hands. For the agent, who has no history of his own, is created for the sole purpose of fulfilling the destiny of the subject—who has "gotten what was coming to him": it is always his story that *get* tells.

ANNA GRANVILLE HATCHER

The Johns Hopkins University

TROIS QUERELLES ET LEURS RENSEIGNEMENTS
POUR L'HISTOIRE DU THÉÂTRE FRANÇAIS
AU XVII^e SIÈCLE

Trois documents inédits

Les actes notariés ayant fourni matière à cette étude paraissent de prime abord d'importance tout à fait secondaire. Ces minutes font mention de querelles dont certaines ont même dégénéré en rixes. Or ces faits ne peuvent être considérés comme importants. Cependant nous aurions tort de les passer sous silence car elles contiennent des détails permettant de compléter à plus d'un point de vue les connaissances acquises jusqu'à présent sur la vie théâtrale du XVII^e siècle. En outre, dans ces pièces, que le hasard de nos dépouillements nous a fait découvrir, les noms de quelques personnalités ayant joué un rôle dans l'évolution du théâtre de leur temps ont été retrouvés, ce qui nous permettra de les remettre à l'étude.

Le premier acte notarié qui appelle l'attention est celui du 5 juin 1606.¹ Il nous apprend que trois jours auparavant Valleran le Conte, Estienne de Ruffin et Hugues Guéru, tous les trois comédiens du roi, se promenaient ensemble à Paris, dans la rue Mon-

the result of the agent's activity, just as in the case of causative verbs in general (*we close the shop at 7:00* > *the shop closes at 7:00*).

¹ Archives nationales, Minutier central, fonds xv, liasse 16. Voir pièce justificative No. 1. Nous faisons suivre l'analyse de ces pièces à la fin de l'article.

torgueil, Jehan Riocrocq, cordonnier, leur barra la route. Une discussion s'en suivit, les poings furent serrés et les épées tirées . . . à deux reprises le cordonnier fut touché. Celui-ci ne se laissa pas faire et exigea une indemnité. Le 5 juin les quatre batailleurs se trouvent dans l'étude du notaire Cuvillyer, Valleran, de Ruffin et Guéru y payent la somme de huit livres tournois au cordonnier et ce dernier déclare acquitter ses trois antagonistes de tous autres dommages et intérêts.

Ce simple récit nous dévoile un secret. Nous savons que Valleran le Conte et son poète attitré Alexandre Hardy sont venus, dans l'année 1606, pour la seconde fois à Paris et que, dans cette ville, Valleran avait adjoint² à la troupe qui l'accompagnait deux jeunes acteurs, Estienne de Ruffin et Alexandre du Mesnil. Il n'est signalé nulle part quels étaient les comédiens qui faisaient partie à ce moment de cette bande. Les premières données concernant la composition de celle-ci nous les tirons du bail de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne du 6 août 1607³ trouvé par Fransen. L'accord du 5 juin révèle maintenant que Hugues Guéru a aussi participé à la rixe dans la rue Montorgueil. On peut en conclure qu'il était déjà membre de la troupe de Valleran à ce moment-là; ce comédien qui acquerra plus tard tant de célébrité comme farceur à l'Hôtel de Bourgogne sous le nom de Gaultier Garguille n'a donc pas, ainsi que M. Magne, son biographe,⁴ l'a supposé, commencé sa profession d'acteur en 1615, ni même en 1607, date avancée par Fransen; mais ses débuts doivent être placés antérieurement à 1606; il est hors de doute qu'il a figuré parmi les membres de la troupe venue à Paris avec Valleran en cette dernière année.

Dans la seconde querelle il n'est question que de deux personnes. La première est Mathieu Le Febvre, dit Laporte. Nous disposons actuellement de plusieurs données relatives à ce comédien et directeur de troupe que nous publierons sous peu dans un article consacré à lui et à Marie Venier, sa femme. C'est pourquoi nous nous contenterons d'insister ici sur le fait qu'il était difficile à vivre, en révolte dès que les affaires ne marchaient pas à son gré et toujours prêt à se débattre vivement. Cet acteur au caractère si peu équilibré

² Voir notre *Vie d'Alexandre Hardy, poète du roi*, Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia 1947, vol. xci, number 4, p. 346.

³ *Documents inédits*, Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France, 1927, p. 352.

⁴ *Gaultier Garguille*, 1911.

s'est querellé d'après l'acte notarié du 5 décembre 1610⁵ avec Mathieu de Roger.

Qui était ce personnage? Soulié⁶ et Baluffe⁷ nous donnent des renseignements précieux concernant ce protecteur du théâtre français à Paris, car c'est bien là le rôle qu'a joué Mathieu de Roger. Rigal⁸ n'a compris qu'en partie les détails mentionnés par Soulié et il les a mal interprétés. Fransen a déjà attiré l'attention sur ce fait.⁹ Les données fournies par Baluffe ont été citées en note par Rigal, mais ce dernier y ajoute: "M. Baluffe ne donne pas les preuves de ses assertions, dont quelques-unes, tout au moins, sont fort contestables." Il nous semble que Rigal fait erreur. Baluffe omet en effet de citer ses sources; il y a cependant une nette indication que celles-ci sont authentiques. Ce Moliériste ajoute au nom de Mathieu de Roger le titre de Champluisant, et c'est ce même titre qu'il porte dans les documents trouvés par Soulié. Après le nom de "Champluisant" Baluffe fait suivre entre parenthèses "ou Champlivault ou Champlisant, ad libitem." Cette orthographe fantaisiste des noms que Baluffe n'a pas imaginés, mais qu'il doit avoir rencontrée effectivement, indique clairement qu'il a eu sous la main des documents écrits par des clercs de notaire; ceux-ci se permettaient d'estropier les noms dans presque tous leurs actes, comme ils l'ont fait d'ailleurs dans des dizaines de minutes trouvées par nous. On peut en déduire que les renseignements de Baluffe sont fondés sur des actes dont il faut tenir compte.

En outre—comme nous le démontrerons par la suite—les données fournies par Baluffe s'associent si étroitement avec tout ce que l'on peut déduire des documents se rapportant à Mathieu de Roger et publiés par Soulié que, d'après nous, il n'y a aucune raison de douter des communications faites par Baluffe.

Il est naturellement résulté de cette confusion que, dans leurs travaux, les érudits se sont attardés trop peu à Mathieu de Roger, bien qu'il mérite un sort meilleur. Maintenant nous allons lui rendre la place tenue par lui de son vivant.

⁵ Archives nationales, Minutier central, fonds xv, liasse 20. Voir pièce justificative N° 2.

⁶ Soulié, *Recherches sur Molière*, Paris 1863, pp. 156 et 157.

⁷ *Molière inconnu*, Sa vie, t. I, Paris 1886, p. 319.

⁸ *Le théâtre français avant la période classique*, Paris 1901, p. 63.

⁹ *Doc. inédits*, p. 339.

Dans l'année 1614 c'est depuis plus de deux ans que l'Hôtel de Bourgogne est sans représentations des comédiens du roi.¹⁰

Parmi ceux qui ont mis tout en œuvre pour faire renaître le théâtre français à Paris il faut compter Mathieu de Roger, sieur de Champluisant. L'acte notarié susmentionné du 5 décembre 1610 prouve que M. de Roger était déjà à cette époque en étroite relation avec les comédiens du roi. En apprenant que la troupe de François de Vautrel, bannie en 1612 à perpétuité de tout le royaume de France par le Capitoul de Toulouse, puis acquittée du bannissement¹¹ par Louis XIII en septembre 1613, était de retour en France, de Roger se met aussitôt en contact avec elle et, le 27 juin 1614, il signe un bail de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne donnant le droit, à François de Vautrel et à ses camarades, de représenter à partir de cette dernière date jusqu'au 30 septembre 1614.¹² Mathieu de Roger arrive même à obtenir pour cette compagnie des conditions très avantageuses auprès des Confrères. Grâce à sa collaboration le théâtre français à Paris renaît enfin.

La troupe de François de Vautrel n'a pas eu apparemment l'intention de proroger ni de renouveler le bail de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne. Le 30 septembre les portes du théâtre de la rue Mauconseil seront de nouveau closes et personne ne pourra dire pour combien de temps. Mathieu de Roger est d'avis que cette fermeture doit être évitée à tout prix. Il faut que l'Hôtel de Bourgogne reste ouvert et que des comédiens français figurent sur sa scène. Afin de réaliser ceci Mathieu de Roger se met en rapport avec une autre troupe qui vient d'arriver à Paris, la compagnie de Monsieur le Prince sous la direction de Claude Husson, sieur de Longueval. Nicolas Gasteau qui avait suivi fidèlement Valleran le Conte pendant de longues années fait partie de cette troupe à ce moment-là.¹³ Claude Husson veut bien donner pendant quelque temps des représentations à l'Hôtel de Bourgogne. Les désirs de Mathieu de Roger ne se bornent pas à cela, il ne veut pas voir les comédiens français installés dans la salle de la rue Mauconseil seulement pour une courte durée, mais ils doivent y exercer leur art au moins

¹⁰ Cf. *La vie théâtrale à Paris de 1612 à 1614*, Modern Language Notes, January 1948.

¹¹ Campardon, *Les comédiens du roi de la troupe française*, Paris 1879, pp. 279 et 280, Lettre de rémission.

¹² Soulié, *Recherches*, p. 156.

¹³ Soulié, *op. cit.*, p. 157.

pendant tout l'hiver jusqu'à Pâques prochain. Claude Husson finit par succomber à ses instances et Mathieu de Roger sert une fois de plus d'intermédiaire auprès des Confrères de la Passion. Ceux-ci ne voient pas d'objection à louer leur salle pour sept mois à la troupe de Monsieur le Prince moyennant un loyer de 1400 livres tournois, mais ils exigent une garantie pour cette somme élevée. Mathieu de Roger n'hésite pas à être caution des comédiens. C'est de la sorte qu'il loue l'Hôtel de Bourgogne pour Claude Husson et les siens du premier octobre 1614 au samedi du dimanche de la Passion 1615. Ce bail n'a pas été retrouvé jusqu'à présent et Franssen a omis de le mentionner dans la liste des baux de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne.¹⁴ De la sentence du Châtelet du 2 janvier 1615,¹⁵ publiée par Soulié, nous déduisons néanmoins que ce bail a dû exister. Une autre sentence découverte par Soulié, celle du 16 janvier 1615,¹⁶ donne de plus à entendre que plusieurs comédiens du roi dont François de Vautrel, Hugues Guéru et d'autres se sont associés avec les acteurs de Monsieur le Prince pour la période susmentionnée.

Après sept semaines d'activité de cette troupe à l'Hôtel de Bourgogne des difficultés surgirent; celles-ci furent telles que les représentations cessèrent le 22 novembre 1614. Ce furent sans doute les Confrères de la Passion qui rendirent la vie difficile aux comédiens; en effet ceux-ci n'avaient effectué aucun paiement du loyer. Les Confrères ne manquèrent pas de protester; les sentences du Châtelet du 2 et du 16 janvier 1615, dont nous avons déjà parlé plus haut, condamnent les comédiens à acquitter la somme due; ils persistent dans leur refus et craignant à bon droit que les Confrères ne prennent des mesures sévères contre eux, ils quittent la capitale en toute hâte. Rigal¹⁷ remarque à ce sujet qu'ils laissèrent une dette de 1400 livres tournois, mais ceci est inexact. Le Châtelet a condamné les acteurs au paiement du loyer pour la période allant du premier octobre au 22 novembre 1614 "et ce à raison de 1400 livres, à compter depuis ce jour premier octobre au samedi du dimanche de la Passion ensuivant." Ce qui revient à dire que les comédiens étaient débiteurs de 350 livres tournois environ.

C'est encore à un autre point de vue que Rigal s'est trompé. Il dit: "Mathieu de Roger abandonne ses protégés." C'est contraire à la vérité. Les comédiens de Monsieur le Prince qui ont décampé abandonnent leur protecteur qui est resté garant pour le

¹⁴ *Doc. inédits*, p. 352 seq.

¹⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 157.

¹⁶ *Idem.*

¹⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 63.

loyer. Les conséquences qui en résultent ne se font pas attendre. Les confrères exigent que Mathieu de Roger paye. Celui-ci ne pouvant ou ne voulant pas les satisfaire, les Maîtres et Gouverneurs de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne perdent patience et font appel à la justice. Mathieu de Roger est emprisonné pour dettes au Grand Châtelet. Baluffe à qui nous empruntons ce détail a soin d'y ajouter "comme Molière."

Mathieu de Roger a donc dû payer cher sa passion du théâtre et son dévouement aux comédiens français. Pour autant que nous le sachions il est aussi le seul des différentes personnes ayant pris l'engagement d'être caution des comédiens qui ait eu à subir la peine d'emprisonnement pour son aide désintéressée témoignée aux acteurs.

Quant à la querelle qu'il eut en 1610 avec Mathieu Le Febvre, dit Laporte, celle-ci s'est terminée tout autrement. Le 5 décembre de la même année les deux hommes signent dans l'étude du notaire Cuvillyer un "arrangement à l'amiable, mettant fin aux querelles survenues entre eux." L'accord qui nous le signale est encore intéressant par le côté suivant. Baluffe a dit à propos de Mathieu de Roger qu'il a été "directeur ou, du moins, caution d'un directeur de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne." Rigal remarque à ce sujet "Il semble bien à lire l'*Inventaire* que le sieur de Champluisant ne fût pas lui-même comédien."¹⁸ Dans une note allant de pair avec le signalement du bail du 27 juin 1614 Fransen écrit: "Le bail ne permet pas à croire avec M. Rigal que M. de Roger fût comédien." Il y a là donc une fois de plus confusion. Tout doute concernant la qualité de Mathieu de Roger est levé maintenant. En effet, dans notre minute du 5 décembre 1610 Mathieu de Roger est "Bourgeois de Paris" et non pas comédien.

L'acte notarié du 19 novembre 1657¹⁹ relate que l'année dernière "des excès sont commis" à l'entrée de la salle de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne par Pierre Jacquinet, cheveu-léger de la garde du roi, contre Anthoine Martin, dit La Lande. A la date susmentionnée les deux hommes se rendent chez le notaire où Anthoine Martin "quitte Pierre Jacquinet . . . de toutes les indemnités auxquelles il pourrait prétendre et il s'engage à ce qu'aucun comédien ne puisse prétendre quelque chose contre ledit Pierre."

¹⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 63, note 2.

¹⁹ Archives nationales, Minutier central, fonds xv, liasse 167. Voir pièce justificative No. 3.

Cette querelle entre deux personnes totalement inconnues met en lumière un fait demeuré inconnu jusqu'à présent. Anthoine Martin, dit La Lande, fait selon la minute fonction de "*receveur des comédiens de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne*." Tallemant des Réaux²⁰ et Courval-Sonnet²¹ ont dit que les chefs de troupe, Valleran le Conte, François de Vautrel et Mathieu Le Febvre, dit Laporte, recevaient eux-mêmes l'argent à l'entrée de la salle. Plus tard les troupes ont engagé des portiers qui avaient l'habitude de s'approprier une partie de la recette. Pour éviter ce larcin constant on les astreignait parfois à glisser les deniers reçus dans une boîte soigneusement fermée, mais cette précaution même n'arrivait pas à mettre fin à leur propre enrichissement. Or, maintenant nous savons grâce à la dispute entre Anthoine Martin et Pierre Jacquinot que tous ces procédés n'étaient plus en usage et que l'organisation de la troupe et du théâtre a fait un nouveau progrès. Ni les acteurs, ni les portiers n'avaient rien à voir avec la perception du prix des places et l'administration de la recette et des dépenses dans l'année 1657. Les comédiens de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne avaient renoncé à ce travail; ils avaient pris à leur service un receveur dont la responsabilité était engagée!

Le rang que tenait ce fonctionnaire dans la troupe est également précisé dans cet acte notarié. Le receveur se charge de veiller à ce qu'aucun des comédiens ne puisse exiger quelque indemnité de Pierre Jacquinot; cela signifie qu'Anthoine Martin n'est pas le subalterne qui ait à se soumettre sans contestation aux ordres des acteurs. Il peut faire sentir son autorité; on écoute sa parole, sa prière, son conseil. Dans la troupe il exerce un certain pouvoir—le poste qu'il occupe a de l'importance.

Mais à un autre point de vue aussi la querelle d'Anthoine Martin et de Pierre Jacquinot a de l'intérêt. Nous savons qu'à l'entrée de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne l'animation ne manquait pas et que la tranquillité dans la rue Mauconseil était fréquemment troublée par des scènes tumultueuses. De la sentence du Châtelet du 3 septembre 1624 renouvelant "les défenses du 4 février 1611 de faire insolences aux portes de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne"²² on peut déduire cet état de choses.

Ces effronteries, qui divertissaient la foule dans l'attente, n'étaient

²⁰ *Historiettes*, tome VII, p. 170.

²¹ *Les exercices de ce temps*, Satire IX, Le débauché, t. II, p. 102.

²² Soulié, *op. cit.*, p. 158.

pas l'unique raison du vacarme à l'entrée de la salle. Parmi ceux qui désiraient assister aux représentations, il y en avait qui essayaient de rentrer sans bourse délier et de prendre leur place d'assaut en se servant au besoin de l'épée pour se débarrasser du gêneur. Bruscombille s'en est plaint dans un style pittoresque dans son *Prologue contre l'avarice*, Sorel²³ a signalé les fraudeurs, Chapuzeau²⁴ une fois de plus communique pour 1674 que les portiers avaient la charge d'arrêter ceux qui "voudraient passer outre sans billet," et tous les érudits qui ont fait l'étude de la vie théâtrale du dix-septième siècle l'ont répété à leur tour.

Il est naturellement impossible de mettre tous ces témoignages en doute. Néanmoins jusqu'à présent nous ne possédions aucun document signalant les délits susmentionnés, les noms des délinquants et les phases successives d'événements semblables. Nous avons toujours dû nous contenter de la constatation pure et simple des infractions aux règlements en vigueur; une pièce authentique de l'époque prouvant qu'un spectateur avait commis des insolences et voulait, en effet, pénétrer dans la salle sans payer faisait défaut.

Cette lacune est comblée maintenant. La rixe de 1656 à l'entrée du théâtre de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne a dû naître de quelque effronterie faite par Pierre Jacquinot ou ce qui est plus probable de son refus de payer sa place. Il a voulu forcer l'entrée de la salle et c'est au receveur qui s'est mis au travers de son passage et aux comédiens qui se sont portés au secours de leur fonctionnaire, c'est à eux tous qu'il a fait sentir la force de ses poings et peut-être même le tranchant de son épée.

Cette troisième querelle, la dernière de celles que nous venons de traiter et l'acte notarié du 19 novembre 1657 auquel nous avons emprunté ces données ont donc bien une signification toute particulière. Ensemble ils nous apportent la preuve irréfutable de faits auxquels nous avons dû croire en invoquant l'autorité d'auteurs contemporains ou souvent même d'une époque plus ou moins postérieure.

Analyse des pièces justificatives.

No. 1. *Archives nationales, Minutier central, fonds xv, liasse 16.*
1606, 5 juin.

Jehan Rioerocq, cordonnier, tient quitte moyennant une indemnité de 8 livres tournois Valleran le Conte, Estienne de Ruffin, Hugues Guéru, des deux coups d'épées que ceux-ci lui ont données le deux juin rue Montorgueil.

²³ *Maison des jeux*, Livre III, p. 424.

²⁴ *Théâtre français*, p. 236.

No. 2. *Archives nationales, Minutier central, fonds xv, liasse 20.*
1610, 5 décembre.

Arrangement à l'amiable entre Mathieu de Roger, bourgeois de Paris, et Mathieu Le Febvre, sieur de Laporte, demeurant rue Beaurepaire, mettant fin aux querelles survenues entre eux.

No. 3. *Archives nationales, Minutier central, fonds xv, liasse 167.*
1657, 19 novembre.

Anthoine Martin, dit La Lande, receveur des comédiens de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne, rue Montorgueil, quitte Pierre Jacquinot, cheveu-leger de la garde du roi de toutes les indemnités auxquelles il pourrait prétendre du fait des excès contre lui commis voici un an par led. Pierre, et s'engage à ce qu'aucun des comédiens ne puisse prétendre quelque chose contre led. Pierre.

S. WILMA DEIERKAUF-HOLSBOER

Meudon, S. et O.

MIDDLE-ENGLISH POEMS BY MYDWYNTER

I

In *MLN* LIII (1938) 239-245, and *JEGP* xxxix (1940) 230-238, Rossell Hope Robbins advanced the interesting, and attractive, theory that a large part of the anonymous ME religious verse written during the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries was the work of members of the Franciscan order. Their purpose was presumably to render clear and memorable to the laity various theological dogmas cherished by their order. This poetic activity was considerably blunted by the Black Death which wrought severe decimation among the Franciscans.

The text of two religious poems which might be fitted into the tradition proposed by Robbins, although possibly composed many decades after the Black Death, is preserved uniquely in British Museum MS Harley 2383, ff. 25^v-30^r. The poems, which lack titles, are attributed therein to a certain Johannes Mydwynter, concerning whose life nothing is known. They treat, in pedestrian fashion, such familiar medieval themes as the joy of heaven, the pains of purgatory, and the seven deadly sins.¹

Harley MS 2383 is a collection of miscellaneous theological tracts

¹In assigning titles, I follow the suggestions in Carleton Brown and Rossell Hope Robbins, *The Index of Middle English Verse* (1943) # 2063; # 2079.

in Latin and English. Mydwynter's poems constitute item # 25 and are introduced in the *Cat. Harl. MSS.* (v, 2380, 150 ff.) as follows: *Hunc tractatum, una cum aliis qui sequuntur, collegisse videtur quidam Johannes Mydwynter: atque in usum descripsisse cujusdam Simonis Smyht, ie. Smythe.* As to the provenance, Mr. T. C. Skeat of the British Museum writes that the first complete leaf (f. 1) bears the date "17 Maii 1715" written in the hand of Humfrey Wanley, Harley's librarian, whose diary shows that "he purchased it from Robert Burscough." "This provenance is confirmed by Bernard *Catalogus Manuscriptorum Angliae* (1697) p. 233, # 7649.30, where it figures in Burscough's library. The MS measures 9 x 6 in., and is written on paper in a variety of hands of the fifteenth century. There is a pencil note on the front fly-leaf 'Sec. XV. ut auguro vel versus fin XIV,' but this is certainly incorrect; in fact most of the hands, including that of ff. 25^v-30^r seem fairly well on in the fifteenth century." Dr. C. F. Bühler of the Morgan Library, who examined the MS on another occasion, writes me that he would date it the "third quarter" of the fifteenth century, and notes that Stafford, Archbishop of Canterbury (1443-1452) discourses on tithes in one of the tracts. This dating seems reasonable enough; and is confirmed by the normalized language and late features (e. g. *th* beside *p*).

The text of the Mydwynter poems is presumably apograph rather than holograph, at least it is a copy rather than a first draft since there are no alterations or corrections. The pointing, which I have not attempted to reproduce in the diplomatic transcription below, is provided by a linear bracket joining the couplets. This is characteristic of many fifteenth century MSS (e. g. the verses on the works of mercy in Harley MS 3954, ff. 81^r-82^v). All expansions of abbreviations are indicated by italics.

II

The Joy of Heaven, and how to win it

- 1 Man in heuyn hyt ys mery to dw[e]lle (25^v)
 fyfste the wey *and* seth the ioye y woll the telle
 Man loke þat þou be trew *merciful and* kynde
 The pascioun of cryste *and* þe werkys of mercy take wel yn mynde
- 5 Man be wel ware of all maner dedely syn
 And beþinke þe wel þat thou fall not þere yn
 Loke þat thou loue wel god ful of myzte *and* kepe þe in elen lyyfe
 And loue wel powre men *and* þyn euyncrestoun be y þoute eny stryfe

- Kepe wel godes heste whyle *thou* art alyue
 10 And rewle þe wel yn all thyng with þy wyttes fyue
 Loke þat *thou* haue stydfaste feyth with hope and perfite charite
 As powle yn hys pystyl and þe gospell telluþe to þe
 Dedely synnes forsake them alle seuen (26r)
 Pus with grace and mercy of cryste *thou* myzte com to heuen
 15 Pere *thou* schalte a see owre saueowr god kyng ful of myzte
 And alle þat hym hauethe yloued yn trewþe and in ryzte
 Pere ys more ioye and blysse þan eny man can telle
 Well both þukke soules that pere yn mow dwelle
 ffurste þey schul se with hure yen bryzte
 20 Many a fayre blysfulle syzte
 Þey schull pere god ful of myzte apertely see
 More ioy þan þat syzte ys may non bee
 To see owre lorde owre saueoure owre kyng
 Almyztty god maker of alle þyng
 25 ffor as he ys þey schull hym se þan
 soþefaste god and soþefaste man
 Throw wyche syzte þey schull know
 And se all þyng bothe hy and low
 And se all þe werkus that þey euere wrouzte
 30 And eche mannes dede and ech mannes þouzte
 And alle þe urþe and alle þe heuenes abowte
 And alle þyng þat ys beryn and beþowte
 Alle þey schulle se þrouze myzte of grace
 Yn þe bryztnesse of goddys face
 35 Of wych þey schulle euere more haue syzte
 þat makuthe moste ioy in heuen bryzte (26v)
 And fore þey schulle euere þis god beholde
 Þey schulle know all þyng þat þey know wolde
 Here men knowþe hym þrouze stydfaste fey and grace
 40 But in heuen men schulle see in hys swete face
 And þat syzte schulle alle men haue
 Withowte ende þat schulle be saue
 No body lyche ye myzte neuere in þis worlde a see
 Apoynte of such bryztnessee as þere schall bee
 45 ffore þere ys more ioye and blysse þan eny man telle may
 Þey he leuyd for the begynny[n]g of the worlde into domesday
 Now þenke we in þis ioyfulle place
 And amendy we vs and axe we mercy and grace
 ffor alle myztty god ys more redy to geue mercye
 50 þan eny man or woman be forto axeye
 ffor þrouze þe vertu of cristes pascioun alle men schull be caue
 þat in trew fey and hope and charite hys mercy wolle craue
 Now praye we to Ihesu owre mercyfulle kyng
 ffor hys mercy and hys grace passeth all opere þyng
 55 Thus þrouz hys gret mercye and hys suete grace
 We mow in heuen see hys suete face

- Pat euere ys so fayre *and* bryzte
 Pat in heuen zeueth most ioy comferte *and* lyzte
 We schull alleso see þere apertelye (27r)
- 60 Hys blessyd modure seint marye
 Pat nexte syttuþe alle myztty gode in heuen bryzte
 Aboue alle angelse *and* þat ys ryzte
 ffor he chesse hure to hys modure dere
 And of hure toke flesche *and* blode here
- 65 And fouchedesauē to souke of hure breste
 Þerefore hyt ryzte sche sytte hym nexte
 sche ys so fayre þere sche sytte
 Pat hure fayrnesse passeth alle mannes wytte
 And sche prayethe for vs euere mercy *and* grace
- 70 Pat we mote com in to *that* ioyfulle place
 We schull se þere as þe boke telluthe vs
 Alle þe IX orderse of angelse
 That buth so fayre on to loke
 And so bryzte as telluthe þe boke
- 75 Pat alle the fayrnesse of þis worlde here
 Pat euere was ysey fere or nere
 Pat eny man myzte ordeyn more or lasse
 Were note apoynte to þat fayrnesse
 Pat we schulle se þere of *that* syzte
- 80 Of þe orders of angelse bryzte
 We schulle hem fulle plesant see þane
 And seruabulle to gode *and* to manne
 And eche ordere in hure degre (27v)
- 85 But to god *and* to man ryzte
 A grete ioy schall be þare of þat syzte
 ffor eche angele *and* eche seint by hym sylfe alone
 Schalle clerere schyne þan euere sonne schon
 Pat syzte men may a grete ioye calle
- 90 To se angelse *and* seinttes so bryzte þan alle
 Pere ys endeles blysse amonge angelse *and* seintes togedure
 Pus ioyfull syztte schall all haue þat schall com þedure
 Pey schulle see seinttes hundred þousondes and moo
 Pat euere worscypputh alle myztty gode *and* prayþe for vs alsoo
- 95 ffor in heuen angels *and* seinttes prayþe for vs mercy *and* grace
 Pat we mote com þedure in to þat ioyfulle place
 Pere ys more worscyppe to god of angelse *and* seinttes yfere
 þan euere couþe pope or eny clerke tel in þis worlde here
 Pere ys more ioye *and* comferte of seinttes þan euere knew eny kyngē
- 100 Saui owre lorde Ihesu criste þat knowþe alle þynge
 Pus þere ys more ioye *and* blysse in heuen
 þan eny herte may þynke or tong may nemyn
 Or ere may here or ye may see
 To alle þuk þat schalle ysaued bee (28r)

- 105 Pus telluth þe gospel pystyl and alle holy wrytte
 As poule in hys pystyl wytnesseth hyt
 In heuen we schulle do non oþere þyng
 But worscyppe alle myztty god heuen kyng
 We schulle be clothede and þere fede in þat ioyfulle place
- 110 With bryztnesse and comfort of alle myztty goddes face
 In heuen ys more murþe mynstralsi and angeles glee
 Þan euere was in þis worlde or euere schalle bee
 In heuen euery trewe cristyn men schalle haue more mede
 Þan eny man may tell or in eny boke rede
- 115 Pus ioy and blysse ys ordaynede as holy wryzt telluþe me
 to alle þulke þat loueþe welle gode full of myzte in perfyte fay and
 charite
 Now forsake we syn and wykednesse in alle maner þyng
 And loue we and worschyppe we welle owre heuen kyng
 Now alle halowen pray for vs mercy and grace
- 120 Pat we mot duelle in heuen in þat ioyfulle place
 Ihesu owre saueowre for his passion that he suffred for vs vpon the
 rode tre
 Grante vs for hys passion and his grace and his mercy þat hit so be
 Yworschyppe be alle myztty god owre saueoure þat for vs wold be
 bore
 To sauy vs with his passion þat we schull nozte be ylore
- 125 And alle holy prophetes prophesyde long þere byfore
 Of Ihesu criste and of ys rewfulle passion and of ys wondes sore
 Ihesu seythe to al men haueth þis in mynde (28v)
 Alle þyng þat y suffred hit was to sauy mankynde
 A rewfulle pascoun man y suffred for loue to sauy þe
- 130 forsake thou thy syn now man for loue of me
 Marcy axe and make þe clene and y forzeue þe
 Do no more amys but þnyke what y suffred for þe
 Loke man in to my woundes what blode þey haueþe y lete
 Loke man in to my body how sore hit ys ybete
- 135 Loke man dou[n]wards to my fete þat nayled buth to þe rode
 Loke man upwards to my hede þat renneth alle on blode
 Byholde my body with scorgys y suongon
 My fete my hondyn with naylles y stongon
 Loke myn hede y crownede with naylles scharpe
- 140 And with a sper y stonge to þe herte
 iij þowsande and syx hondrede wondes sore
 I suffred for þe man and moche more
 Pus harde pascioun y suffrede for þe man y wyase
 To byge thy soule to ioie and heuen blysse
- 145 þerefor euery man schull haue cristes passion in mynde
 And þenke what Ihesu suffrede for loue of mankynde
 ffor prouze þe vertu of cristes pascioun we schull haue more mede
 þen euere myzte eny man telle or yn eny boke rede
 Man alle þyng þat criste suffrede here hit was for loue of þe

- 150 *Pere fore þou art most y hold of alle þyng to loue hym aȝe* (29r)
 Now be we alle louy and kynde
 And haue we welle *cristes* pascioun in mynde
 Now þonke we ihesu in alle þyng
 Owre saucoure *and* owre heuen kynge
- 155 *Pat hathe y sauede and y schede his blode þere fore*
Pere fore worscyppe we hym now and euere more
Euery man schull haue cristes pascioun in mynde
 And þynke what he suffrede to sauyn mankynde
 Seint Jerom seyþe alle men by vertu of *cristes* pascioun schulle besaue
- 160 *Pat in trew fey and charite his mercy wolke craue*
 Take we þus in mynde *and* forsake syn whyl we haue tyme
 And lete we neuere syn brynge oure soule to pyne
 schryue we vs clene of þouȝte worde and dede
and axe we forȝeue[ne]sse and mercy thys ys the beste rede
- 165 *Gregory seyþe criste ys more redy to ȝeu mercye*
 Þen eny man or woman be for to axye
 Austen seyþe *that criste ys so gracouse and mercyfulle kynge*
Pat hys grace and his mercy passythe alle oþere þyng
 Holy wryȝte telluth *and* alle holy clerkus
- 170 *Pat ihesu crystes mercy passeth alle hys werkus*
 Þenke we hereon and amende we vs whyle we maye
 ffor we schull passy hen[ce] we note neuere what daye (29r)
 Now ihesu for hys pascioun mercye and grace
 Graunte vs to dwelle in heuen in þat ioyfulle place
- 175 *Pat hyt so be amen amen for charyte.*

How to escape the pains of purgatory

- 1 Men þenke hereon ofte tyme
 What helpuþe sowles yn purgatoryes pyne
 Pater noster dirige sauter *and* fastyng
 And almsded *and* masse syngyng
- 5 *Þey þe preste þat synguthe þe masse*
 Be neuere so fulle of wrechyduesse
 The sacrament þat ys so holy
 May not apeyryde be þroȝe his foly
 Þen may masse sowles owt of pyn bryng
- 10 *Þey a synfulle preste hym syng*
 ffor in goddesse name he synguþe þe masse
 Vndure wham in ordere he ysse
 But specialle prayowrs with god entent
 Pat both yseyde be fore and afture þe sacrament
- 15 *Of a gode preste byth welle beture*
 Pan of an euylle *and* welle sueture
 But þe holy sacrament of goddes body
 Helputhe the sowles princepally
 Almesdede helputhe soules meche also (30r)

- 20 And wel þe more and hyt be in perfyte charyte ydo
 He þat wyste how meche dirige helputh soules in purgatory also
 He wolde sey dirige welle oftore þan he do
 Off alle prayours to helpe sowles owt of pyn to reste
 for soþe the holy pater noster ys þe beste
- 25 Pray we for sowles to helpe hem owt of pyn
 We schulle passy hen we not neuere what tym
 Ihesu for hys pascioun mercye and grace
 Graunte vs in heuen blisse to see hys suete face
 þat hyt so be amen amen pur charyte.

Mydwyntir

The Joy of Heaven, etc.

- l. 2 seth, adv., afterwards l. 4 MS reads *pascōn* (?); or *pasciōn* (?); and so on lines 143, 147, 153, 157, 174.
- i. 8 eunynerystoun, n., fellow Christians (usually translating Lat. *proximi*).
- l. 13 An exhaustive dissertation on the seven deadly sins is that by Marie Gothein, "Die Todsünden," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, x (1907) 416-484. For ME versions, see Wells, *A Manual of the Writings in Middle-English*, pp. 350, 352.
- l. 16 MS has *lowed* with a line drawn through the first stroke of *w*.
- l. 18 *buth*, pres. pl. A Southwest Midland form; cf. H. C. Wyld, *A Short History of English*³, § 205 for a handy table of Midland dialect characteristics. A masterly discussion of geographical distribution of dialects is that of S. Moore, H. Whitehall, and S. R. Meech, "Middle English Dialect Characteristics and Boundaries," *University of Michigan Essays and Studies in English and Comparative Literature*, XIII (1935) 1-60.
- l. 21 apertly, adv., clearly, evidently (and in l. 59 below).
- l. 44 apoynte, pp., declared.
- l. 66 supply *is* after *hyt*.
- l. 75 MS has *here* dotted for erasure before *worlde*.
- l. 104 þuk = thilk, i. e., those.
- l. 125 þere; read *yere* (?), i. e. "many years ago."
- l. 127 Cf. Carleton Brown, *Religious Lyrics of the XIVth Century*, # 51; "Christ's Appeal to Man"; # 127: "Jesus appeals to man by the Wounds." Brown suggests that the theme derives from Caesarius of Arles, *De Iudicio extremo* (Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, xxxix, col. 2207).
- l. 137 *suongon* = *swongen*, v., to beat, afflict.
- l. 141 3600 wounds. I have been unable to discover any parallel to this number. The mention of the wounds of Christ is common in medieval literature (cf. W. F. Cumming, *The Revelations of Saint Birgitta*, EETS OS 178, p. xxxviii, quoting from Sloane MS 3548, f. 118r). *The Cath. Encycl.*, s. v. wounds, notes a tradition of 5466 wounds inflicted on Jesus during the Passion.
- l. 144 byge, v., buy, redeem, atone for (as in *P. Plowman* B xi, 202).
- l. 151 louy, pres. part., i. e. loving. Southern and Kentish forms often had this for the -ian infinitive; cf. Wyld, § 342.
- l. 172 MS reads *nete* (?).

How to escape, etc.

1. 1 The content of this poem may be compared to "Of þe relefyng of saules in purgatory," in BM. Additional MS 37, # 049 f. 24r; to the *Pricke of Conscience*, ll. 2892 ff.; to *The Gast of Gy* (Queens College, Oxford, MS 383 version; printed by Bowers in Förster's *Beiträge zur Englischen Philologie*, xxxii, 1938), ll. 417 ff., where the Pater Noster, the Ave Maria and the Credo are cited as being most beneficial to be sung for souls in purgatory.
1. 8 apeyryde, v., be impaired, nullified, or weakened.
1. 16 MS reads *and before euylle*. *sueture*, n., practitioner.
1. 29 pur. Evidently the French prep. *pour*, although the *NED* affords no authority for, or example of, such an early usage.

R. H. BOWERS

University of Florida

A QUAINT CONCEIT FROM GUARINI TO DRYDEN

The use of the word "die" in sexual signification was not infrequent among English writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.¹ Mr. Cleanth Brooks has recently discussed a probable example of it in Donne's "Canonization."² Many other passages could be cited in which the euphemism is more obvious. Shakespeare's Pandarus sings, with his accustomed unambiguous ambiguity:

These lovers cry Oh! ho! they die!
Yet that which seems the wound to kill
Doth turn Oh! ho! to ha! ha! he!
So dying love lives still. . . .³

Benedict says to his Beatrice: "I will live in thy heart, die in thy lap, and be buried in thy eyes."⁴ Donne in "The Damp" writes:

Kill mee as Woman, let me die
As a mere man;

in "The Prohibition":

Love mee, that I may die the gentler way;

¹ The *NED* does not list the usage.

² Cleanth Brooks, *The Well Wrought Urn*, New York, 1947, p. 15.

³ *Troilus and Cressida*, III, i, 133-136.

⁴ *Much Ado about Nothing*, v, ii, 104-105. Cf. also *As You Like It*, iv, i, 102.

in "Loves Warre":

Here let me warr; in these armes lett mee lye;
Here lett mee parlee, batter, bleade, and dye.⁶

Robert Herrick also uses the conceit:

I can play, and I can twine
'Bout a Virgin like a Vine:
In her lap too I can lye
Melting and in fancie die:
And return to life, if she
Claps my cheek, or kisseth me.⁷

It would doubtless require some temerity to wish to find the origin and earliest examples of this figure, but we may surmise that it was far more familiar to the readers of Shakespeare and Donne than to the readers of Mr. Brooks, and furthermore that it may have been, like so many images and conceits of the times, an importation from the continent. At any rate, one factor in making it widely familiar to English eyes and ears in the Renaissance was undoubtedly its use in a popular Italian madrigal written by Guarini (and frequently attributed to Tasso)⁸ and set to music by Luca Marenzio and more than a score of other musicians on the continent. It is sometimes entitled: "Concorso d'occhi amorosi," and runs as follows:

Tirsi morir volea,
Gli occhi mirando di colei ch'adora;
Quand'ella, che di lui non meno ardea,
Gli disse, oimè, ben mio,
Deh non morir ancora,
Che teco bramo di morir anch'io.
Frenò Tirsi il desio
Ch'ebbe di pur sua vita al'or finire,
Ma sentia morte in non poter morire.

⁶ *The Poems of John Donne*, ed. Grierson, London, 1929, pp. 14, 57, 60, 101.

⁷ *The Poetical Works of Robert Herrick*, ed. Moorman, Oxford, 1915, p. 17; cf. also pp. 67, 115, 235.

⁸ First, it seems, in the Aldine edition of the *Rime del Signor Torquato Tasso*, Parte Prima . . . , Venice, 1581. The madrigal was published by Guarini in his 1598 edition of his own *Rime*. Several manuscript collections of the sixteenth century attribute this piece to Tasso. I owe this information to the kindness of Mr. Luigi Locatelli of Bergamo. This attribution undoubtedly contributed somewhat to the widespread acquaintance with the little poem.

E mentre il guardo pur fiso tenea
 Ne' begli occhi diuini,
 E'l nettar amoroso indi beuea;
 La bella Ninfa sua, che già vicini
 Sentia i messi d'Amore,
 Disse, con occhi languidi, e tremanti,
 Mori, ben mio, ch'io moro.
 Ed io; rispose subito il pastore,
 E teco nel morir me discoloro.
 Così moriro, i fortunati amanti
 Di morte sì soaue, e sì gradita,
 Che per anco morir tornaro in vita.*

This gracefully licentious little poem reached England, then, on wings of song; it pleased, and was promptly translated. It was first printed in English dress in the first part of Nicolas Yonge's *Musica Transalpina*, in 1588 (songs 16, 17, 18). The unknown translator was probably ignorant of the author's identity. His translation is remarkably literal for a version to be sung to the same music, and it manages to preserve a good deal of Guarini's perverse charm:

Thirsis to die desired,
 marking her eyes that to his hart was neerest:
 And shee that with his flame no lesse was fiered,
 sayd to him: Oh hart's loue deerest:
 Alas, forbear to die now,
 By thee I liue, by thee I wish to die too.
Thirsis that heate refrained,
 wherewith to die poore louer then hee hasted,
 Thinking it death while hee his lookes maintained,
 full fixed on her eyes, full of pleasure,
 and louely Nectar sweet from them he tasted.
 His daintie Nimph, that now at hand espyed
 the haruest of loues treasure,
 Said thus, with eyes all trembling, faint and wasted:
 I die now,
 The Shepheard then replyed,
 and I sweet life doe die too.

* *Rime del Molto Illustre Signor Caualiere Battista Guarini*, In Venetia, Presso Gio. Battista Ciotti, MDIIC, pp. 132^v-133^r. The hendecasyllables of lines 17-18 frequently appear as *settenari*, thus:

Cui rispose il pastore:
 Ed io, mia vita, moro.

See now Alfred Einstein's handsome study of *The Italian Madrigal* (Princeton, 1949), pp. 177, 540, for an antecedent (1541) for Guarini's image and for evidence of the tremendous popularity of this madrigal.

Thus these two Louers fortunately dyed,
Of death so sweet, so happy, and so desired:
That to die so againe their life retired.

The *Musica Transalpina* of 1588 also contains a briefer piece in similar vein (song 42):

Thirsis enjoyed the graces,
Of *Chloris* sweet embraces,
Yet both theyr ioyes were scantied:
For darke it was, and candle-light they wanted.
Wherewith kinde *Cinthia* in the heauen that shined,
her nightly vaile resigned,
and her faire face disclosed.
Then each from others lookes such ioy deriued:
That both with meere delight dyed, and reuiued.

The original of this second *morte amorosa*, with which I am not acquainted, may possibly have been the first Italian imitation of Guarini's poem. It had been set to music by Alfonso Ferrabosco. Both English poems are reprinted together, with slight variations, in *England's Helicon*, in 1600 and in 1614.⁹

A less literal, but more perfectly acclimated and smoother English rendering of Guarini's madrigal was composed, perhaps somewhat later, for the music of Walter Porter, and appeared in the latter's *Madrigales and Ayres*, in 1632,¹⁰ without indication of authorship. The nymph here acquires a name:

Young *Thyrsis* lay in *Phyllis*' lap
And gazing on her eye,
'Steemed life too mean for such good hap,
And fain the boy would die.

When *Phyllis*, who the force did prove
Of love as well as he,
Cried to him: Stay awhile, my love,
And I will die with thee!

So did these happy lovers die,
But with so little pain,
That both to life immediately
Returned to die again.

⁹ Whence I copy them. See *England's Helicon*, ed. H. E. Rollins, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1935, I, 178; cf. II, 181-182.

¹⁰ The collection, which E. H. Fellowes reproduced in his *English Madrigal Verse 1588-1632* (Oxford, 1920), contains at least several pieces dating from the late sixteenth century. The poem in question is on p. 582 in Fellowes.

Still another brief anonymous song of the period stems from the same source; it was published in John Ward's *First Set of English Madrigals* in 1613:

Phyllis the bright, when frankly she desired
Thyrsis, her sweet heart, to have expired;
Sweet, thus fell she a-crying,
Die, for I am a-dying.¹¹

In France, Guarini's poem was no less admired. It figures in two different translations of his madrigals, dated 1623 and 1664. Bense-Dupuis printed the Italian text in his *Apollon* of 1644.¹² Ménage, in his edition of the *Aminta* (1655), refers to "quel vaghissimo Madrigale intitolato *Concorso d'occhi amorosi*, il qual falsamente da alcuni è stato attribuito al Tasso."¹³ Several other French versions or adaptations, some of them in manuscript collections, have been pointed out by Miss Fehrer. I shall quote one which appeared in at least three different places in the seventeenth century: in the *Recueil des pièces galantes* (1663), in the *Recueil de quelques pièces nouvelles et galantes* (1664) and in Ménage's *Anti-Baillet* (1688):

Tirsis d'un excès de plaisir,
Etoit sur le point de mourir
Entre les bras de Filis qu'il adore,
Quand Filis, que l'Amour range sous même loy,
Et que le mesme feu devore,
Luy dit, ah! mon Tirsis, ah! ne meurs pas encore,
Je veux mourir avec toy.
Tirsis alors suspend l'envie;
Qu'il avoit de perdre la vie;
Mais par cette contrainte il se met aux abois,
Et n'osant pas mourir il se meurt mille fois;
Cependant lors qu'au sein de cette jeune Amante,
Le Berger à longs traits boit l'Amoureux poison;
Elle qui sent déjà qu'il entre en pâmoison,
D'un regard languissant, & d'une voix tremblante,

¹¹ E. H. Fellowes, *English Madrigal Verse*, p. 204. One thinks of Sir Robert Ayton's poem "On Love" which smilingly notes:

If all that say they die, had died indeed,
Sur long ere now the world had had an end.

¹² See Miss Catherine Fehrer's unpublished dissertation, *The Madrigal in France to the End of the Seventeenth Century* (Bryn Mawr, 1942), of which I have used a microfilm reproduction.

¹³ Page 178.

Luy dit, mon unique soucy,
 Meurs, mon Tirsis; car ie me meurs aussi.
 Soudain ce Berger tout en flâme,
 Luy répond, comme toy ie me meurs, je me pâme.
 Ainsi dans les ravissements
 Moururent ces heureux Amans;
 Mais d'une mort si douce & si digne d'envie,
 Que pour mourir encor ils reprirent la vie.¹⁴

Another well-circulated version was that published in the 1664 translation of Guarini's madrigals, with the title "Jouissance":

Tirsis vouloit perdre le iour
 En regardant les yeux de celle qu'il adore,
 Quand elle, dont le cœur, n'auoit pas moins d'amour,
 Luy dit, ah! ne meurs pas encore,
 Puis que nos cœurs vivent sous mesme loy
 Je veux mourir avecque toy.
 Tirsis retint le desir qu'il auoit
 De finir lors sa belle vie,
 Mais il souffroit la mort de ce qu'il ne pouuoit
 En mourant assez tost contenter son enuie;
 Et cependant tenoit tousiours ses yeux
 Sur ceux de sa douce ennemie,
 Dont il suçoit le Nectar amoureux.
 Sa belle Nympe enfin qui sentoit les aproches
 Du doux chatouillement qui resout nos humeurs,
 Avec des yeux puissans pour animer des roches,
 Luy dit, mourons Tirsis, ie meurs,
 Et moy, reprit soudain le Berger tout de flame,
 Dans cette mesme mort avec toy ie me pâme.
 Ce fut ainsi que ce couple d'Amans
 Eut vn trépas si plein d'une douceur extrême,
 Que pour mourir encor de mesme,
 Il reuint à la vie apres quelques momens.¹⁵

Meanwhile, of course, numerous reprintings of the Italian text testify to the continued popularity of this madrigal in Italy, where it appeared in editions of Guarini's poetic works, in madrigal col-

¹⁴ Quoted by N. B. Allen, *The Sources of Dryden's Comedies*, 1935, p. 115n. from the *Recueil de quelques pièces nouvelles et galantes* (1664). The same version appears, Miss Fehrer informs me, in the *La Suze-Pelisson Recueil*, Trévoux, 1741.

¹⁵ *Les Madrigaux du Cavalier Guarini, Autevr du Pastor Fido, traduits d'Italien en vers François. Par Monsieur P.* A Paris, Chez Gvillavme de Lvynes, Libraire Iure, au Palais, sous la montée de la Cour des Aydes. M.DC.LXIV. Avec privilège du Roy. P. 51. Copy at Library of Congress.

lections, and with surprising frequency among the *Rime* of Torquato Tasso.

The only important writer to have become interested in this little song seems to have been John Dryden. The editor of several volumes of *Miscellanies* must, of necessity, have encountered our madrigal many times when examining other English or foreign collections of light verse. He was undoubtedly familiar with it in several versions as well as with the original text; it is therefore impossible to determine just which form of the poem he used for the model of his own adaptation, the ultimate source of which has not heretofore been pointed out.¹⁶ Dryden's song was inserted in his comedy, *Marriage A-la-Mode* (printed 1763). Thyrsis and his "daintie nymph," who in England had earlier acquired the name of Phyllis, become now Alexis and Caelia:

Whil'st Alexis lay prest
In her Arms he lov'd best,
With his hands round her neck,
And his head on her breast,
He found the fierce pleasure too hasty to stay,
And his soul in the tempest just flying away.

When *Caelia* saw this,
With a sigh, and a kiss,
She cry'd, Oh my dear, I am robb'd of my bliss;
'Tis unkind of your Love, and unfaithfully done,
To leave me behind you, and die all alone.

The Youth, though in haste,
And breathing his last,
In pity dy'd slowly, while she dy'd more fast;
Till at length she cry'd, Now, my dear, now let us go,
Now die, my *Alexis*, and I will die too.

Thus intranc'd they did lie,
Till *Alexis* did try
To recover new breath, that again he might die:
Then often they di'd; but the more they did so,
The Nymph di'd more quick, and the Shepherd more slow.¹⁷

¹⁶ However, in his study of *The Sources of John Dryden's Comedies*, 1935, p. 115 n., N. B. Allen states that Professor L. I. Bredvold called his attention to the fact that Dryden's song was imitated from the anonymous "French madrigal" which had appeared in 1664 in the *Recueil de quelques piéces nouvelles et galantes*.

¹⁷ *The Songs of John Dryden*, ed. C. L. Day, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1932, pp. 40-42. Day notes that Nicholas Staggins composed the music.

It would be of little interest to trace the fortunes of Guarini's madrigal beyond Dryden's obvious imitation. This is the apogee of its fortune in England, and such fortune is not without honor. For the first time, it loses its English anonymity; henceforth it will be known primarily in Dryden's version,¹⁸ or at least as a typical Restoration or Cavalier lyric. It is only just, at long last, to restore it to its original owner. And it is noteworthy that Guarini's little song, besides playing a considerable rôle in acclimating a celebrated euphemism, far outlived in popularity and prolific power his better-known *Pastor Fido*, and became one of the rare poems of the Cinquecento to relive in a Restoration comedy.¹⁹

CHANDLER B. BEALL

University of Oregon

OLD PROVENÇAL "NOZOL"

"Nozol" occurs in the *Auzels Cassadors* of Daude de Pradas, v. 771, and, if we are to credit E. Rolland,¹ also in the *Flamenca*, v. 2122. Unfortunately, Rolland was in error, since the text of P. Meyer reads:

Una chauesc' os uinozol.

In this situation, however, we have the odd picture of a man's philological instinct being surer than his accuracy in transcription, since, inadvertently, he suggested the correct solution; we should unquestionably read: os (oz) un nozol. The meaning is suggested by the juxtaposition with *chauesca* (mod. Fr. *chevêche*); i. e. we are apparently dealing with a variety of owl. To be sure the verse of Daude:

ab caneta et ab nozol

¹⁸ C. L. Day, *op. cit.*, notes that Dryden's text appeared in several miscellanies from 1672 to 1738, and was immediately imitated in at least one song (by "R. V. Gent." 1672).

¹⁹ A similar fortune befell Ariosto's famous stanza, "La verginella è simile alla rosa" (*Orlando furioso*, I, 42), which also reached England as a madrigal, was several times translated and set to music, and finally became a song in the *Beggar's Opera*. Cf. Alfredo Obertello, "Villanelle e madrigali inediti in Inghilterra," *Italian Studies*, III (1947-1948), 120.

This little study on Guarini's madrigal is a by-product of an investigation of Tasso's influence in England which has been greatly facilitated by grants-in-aid from the University of Oregon and the American Philosophical Society; I am pleased to make grateful acknowledgment here.

¹ *Faune populaire de la France*, Paris, 1877, II, 40 ff.

seems to run counter to this supposition, for *caneta* means 'young duck,' a fact which led one reviewer of my edition² to make the plausible suggestion that we were dealing with water birds. It is now my belief that by the replacement of the base MS^b by MS^v we can remove the seeming disparity between the two cases here cited. The equivalence of the ^v reading: *sueta* with *nozol* and the consequent admissibility of the emendation is the subject of this note. If the point is proved, it would not be the only instance of a quasi-hapax common to the unknown author of the romance and the sports-minded canon of Rodez.

There is a wealth of terms for the *strigidae* in the dialects. The Aveyron, Daude's own country, provides *nichoule*, defined by Vayssier³ 'chevêche, espèce de chouette au cri nocturne et plaintif.' Maps 694 (Hibou) and 1502 (Chouette) of the *Atlas linguistique*, along with Rolland and the *Trésor* of Mistral, record similar forms: *nitsole*, *nitsolo*, *nutsolo*, *nuiteyu*, *niteyulo*, *netola*, *nitola*, *nieola*, *neeoula*, *nitsyule*, *nacholo*, *nichoulo*, *nuechour*.⁴ In this group too, we are to place *nouchoune*, where metaphony and the replacement by the well-known dialectal suffix *-oune* have intervened, also *louchoule*, where assimilation extends to the consonants as well as the vowels; *nouchoulo* (Mistral) shows vowels alone affected.

Evidently Rolland had it in mind that *nozol* was related to this list, since it is included there, although without any demonstration of his reasons. The same statement can be made about the *Supplement-wörterbuch* of Levy, who simply adds, under the rubric mentioned: "vgl. *nuchol*," without further proof. It is clear that the list presented in the preceding paragraph contains a group of terms all related to the word for 'night-owl' (cf. REW 5941) and the popular denomination of these birds as creatures of the darkness has the necessary semantic weight. The etymon is thus a derivative of *nocte* (**noctula* > **noctiola*, etc.), as I now attempt to show.

Firstly, as to vocalism. The variations in the manner of diphthongization in the presence of a palatal are numerous in the Midi. In the accented vowel one encounters, in the modern dialects,

² In *Speculum*, xx (1945), p. 498.

³ *Dict. patois-français de l'Aveyron*, Rodez, 1879.

⁴ No effort is made to show the complicated diacritics of the *Atlas*, which add to printing costs and serve no particular purpose in the present case, unless it be in the barred *e*, as noted later.

niu, *niue*, *neit*, *net*, even *niò*,⁵ alongside of *niuch*, *nueg*, *nuech*, *nueit* in the older language. It is not always essential to have diphthongization; cf. *noil*, *noch* in the older period and a number of variants in the modern dialects (cf. Ronjat, pp. 167-8). Such would be even more the case in unaccented syllable, where reductions occur.

Secondly, as to consonantism. The difficulty seems to be that *-cty-* > *-ch-* more normally. A glance at the list mentioned above, however, shows a number of forms in *-ts-*. Daude himself uses *nueitz* in the *Auzels*. To-day, the *Atlas linguistique*, Map 929 (Nuit), records *nuets* and *nets*. In Old Provençal one could have *fruchas* vs. *fruitz*, *fruiç*; specifically in the *Breviari d'Amor* (Appel, *Chrest.*, 115, 157-8) *frugz*; *vertutz*, which can be spelled *vertuz*, the equivalence of *ts*, *tz*, *z* being clearly established.

To return to our passage and its emendation. It has been seen how *nozol* was equated with *chavesca* in the *Flamenca*. In the Daude passage, the variant for *nozol* in MS^v is Catalan *mussol*, defined: 'Aucell nocturno, tiesso de cos, lo cap tirat en detras, la cara rodona, lo bech revenxinat, ulls grossos e rodons; de tant estranya figura que basta pera agafar aucells.' Phonologically, of course, it has nothing to do with the other terms, since the etymon is *mutilus* (Sp. *mochuelo*), but semantically it shows what the scribe thought the word meant, assuming he had a Provençal original before him and that this was *nozol*. The latter, phonologically and semantically, definitely does not belong with *caneta*, but with *sueta* 'chouette.' There is no need of thinking of *sueta* as being influenced in any way by the Catalan coloring of the MS. The FEW (II, p. 549, col. 2) provides an ample number of cases where *s-* and *ch-* alternate in *chouette*. Rolland (II, 39) mentions both *zouetta* and *souetta*. There is no territorial limit for the phenomenon. Furthermore, we may point out that, if the verse is emended to read:

ab sueta et ab nozol

there is nothing metrically in the way, since *sueta* (FEW < *ca-vanna*) can be counted as three syllables, just as modern Fr. *chouette* is tri-syllabic in verse.

A. H. SCHUTZ

Ohio State University

⁵ J. Ronjat, *Gr. historique des parlers provençaux modernes*, pp. 175, 167, 176 respectively.

⁶ Labernia, *Dicc. de la llengua catalana*, Barcelona, 1840.

GEORGES DE SCUDÉRY AND ANTOINE GODEAU

In my *Georges de Scudéry's 'Almahide'* I showed that Scudéry incorporated his *Salomon instruisant le roy* virtually verbatim in *Almahide*, changing the title to *Salomon instruisant Muley Hazen*.¹ I also indicated that in this work he used with very little textual change his own earlier works or those of others. (Cf. *Le Prince déguisé* and Pierre Davity's *Le nouveau theatre du monde*.) It now appears that the inspiration, if not the actual direct source, of both of these poems was Antoine Godeau's *L'Institution du Prince* (1644). Scudéry first published his *Salomon* in 1651 and again in 1660-1663 in *Almahide*.

Scudéry's approximately 500 verses are written in alexandrines. Godeau likewise used 12-syllable verse in 134 quatrains rhyming *abab*. Each quatrain has its own individual title. Both works are a promulgation of rules for the guidance of the French king with some important variations in topics. Godeau as a churchman is more interested in relationship between church and state, while Scudéry the former soldier dwells at some length on the suggested deportment of a king leading his troops in battle.

Scudéry in *Almahide* prefaces his poem with the statement that at the beginning of Muley Hazen's reign a learned Arab composed such a guide for kings, consisting of a "paraphrase" of all that Salomon had said about them. Louis XIV had just ascended the throne in 1643.²

If Scudéry used Godeau's work as a direct source, he did not copy verbatim as he had done in the case of other borrowings he poured into his novel. There is, however, some internal evidence to indicate that Godeau may have been the direct source.

For example, Godeau urges Louis XIV to "Respecter, & aimer la Reine sa Mere":

Cette Mere sans pair qui par sa vigilance,
De vostre Auguste Sceptre est la garde aujourd'huy,

¹ *The Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages*, Vol. XXXIV, Baltimore, 1939.

² In my monograph (p. 103) I showed that Muley Hazen must be a disguise for Louis XIII since Scudéry refers to him as *Le Juste*, an epithet assigned to Louis.

Doit en vous, quand les Loix finiront sa Regence,
Rencontrer à son tour, sa garde, & son appuy.

(Quatrain LVIII)

Scudéry writes:

Lors que ton Pere mort abandonna la Terre,
Il te laissa fort ieune, & ton Royaume en guerre:
Ta Mere la soustint avec beaucoup d'éclat:
Et prenant hardiment le Tymon de l'Estat;
Prenant tes interests; espousant tes querelles;
Ton Berceau fut couvert de Palmes immortelles; . . .
Imite moy, Muley, par ta reconnaissance.
Que ne luy dois tu point, luy deuant la naissance? . . .
Aime la donc, mon Fils, elle est Mere, elle est Reyne;
Sa Regence fut longue, & ne fut pas sans peine;

(*Almahide*, VIII, 549-550)

Both writers warn that the sovereign will be held accountable by his subjects for his minister's actions, and on the subject of favorites Godeau states:

Aimez, mais en aimant, faites-nous reconnaistre,
Que la seule raison preside à vostre choix,
Prenant vn Fauory, ne prenez pas vn Maistre,
Et sçachez que l'Estat, ne peut souffrir deux Roys.

(Quatrain LXII)

The above lines may be compared with what Scudéry says about ministers:

Aime-le, cheris-le, prens plaisir à le voir;
Mais n'en fais pas ton Maistre, en cedant ton pouuoir;
Qu'il soit au pied du Thrône, & non pas à ta place;

(*Almahide*, VIII, 554)

Godeau has the following to say about the grandeur of God and His supreme power over kings:

Les Roys ne sont pour nous que force & que lumiere,
L'éclair est dans leurs yeux, la foudre est dans leurs mains,
Mais n'en fais pas ton Maistre, en cedant ton pouuoir:
Et la Mort les égale au reste des humains. (Quatrain v)

And Scudéry:

Les Roys portent vn Sceptre, & Dieu porte la Foudre:
Thrône, Sceptre, Couronne, & Roy, tout n'est que poudre:
Vn seul de ses regards, les dissipe en passant,
Comme l'ombre au matin l'est du Soleil naissant:

(*Almahide*, VIII, 548)

Both poets urge that the king bend every effort to save the peace: he should commit his nation to war only after all means to avoid

conflict have been exhausted. Likewise, both writers vigorously attack blasphemy.

Another textual parallel worthy of note is to be found in the instructions concerning keeping one's promises:

Ne donnez point d'espoir qui se trouue friuole,
Soyez ferme & fidelle apres auoir promis,
Et sçachez que la loy de garder sa parole,
Sans dispense, s'étend jusques aux ennemis.

(Quatrain cviii)

Pour te courir d'honneur, obserue tes paroles:
Qu'elles soient en tout temps plus fermes que les Poles:
Vn Prince doit tenir tout ce qu'il a promis,
Sans mesme distinguer l'Amy des Ennemis.

(*Almahide*, VIII, 569-570)

Several other textual comparisons could be offered to show similarities in ideas or in actual phrasing. In some instances, Scudéry appears to have borrowed Godeau's quatrain titles as a starting point for further paraphrasing: "Le Prince doit agir de luy-mesme" (LXVI) and "Escoute ses (the minister's) conseils, mais agis par toy mesme" (*Almahide*, VIII, 555); "Il doit chasser les Flatteurs" (Quatrain C) and "Chasse-les, chasse-les . . ." (*Almahide*, VIII, 569); "Il doit abhorrer le mensonge" (Quatrain CIX) and "Deteste le menteur, & ne le sois iamais." (*Almahide*, VIII, 572); "Soyez sobre à la table" (Quatrain CXVII) in the text of the verse may be compared with "Sois sobre en tes repas." (*Almahide*, VIII, 579.) Both poets urge the king to be gay rather than melancholy, and both admonish him to control his anger when judging subjects lest his ire cause him to commit an unintentional injustice. (Quatrain CXXX and *Almahide*, VIII, 577; Quatrain XLVII and *Almahide*, VIII, 566, respectively.)

The foregoing parallels then show that Godeau and Scudéry were at least thinking along the same lines if the latter did not actually "paraphrase" Godeau. That Godeau and the Scudéry's were on friendly terms as late as September 8, 1650, and that Madeleine at least was reading Godeau's verses are shown in a letter the sister addressed to Godeau.³

JEROME W. SCHWEITZER

The University of Alabama

³ Quoted by Rathery et Boutron in their *Mademoiselle de Scudéry*, Paris, 1873, p. 217.

RICHELET, FORERUNNER OF SAMUEL JOHNSON,
AND DE LORMES

The first author of a dictionary to express extensively his personal likes and dislikes while illustrating the use of words was not Samuel Johnson, but Pierre Richelet, whose habit of belittling or extolling certain individuals is pronounced enough to color his entire work.¹ A good example of his method is supplied by the case of Thomas de Lormes, who is assailed on forty-six different occasions.² There is a poem in the tradition of the Roman epigram to illustrate the use of *achevé*:

Ce que Delorme fait, ce malheureux Rimeur,
Montre que sa bizarre Humeur
Est une folie achevée.

The other allusions are in prose and point out that Thomas de Lormes is inept in the art of poetry and the profession of law. He is a lawyer of lost cases who tries in vain to scale the heights of Parnassus (*s'acréditer*). He remains unblessed by Apollo (*Apol-lon*), who is thoroughly disgusted with his antics (*arriver*). His reputation is *nil* (*afligeant*), but he compensates for the cruel indifference of the public towards his works by indulging in self-praise (*s'admirer*). Although all announcements containing his name are immediately destroyed (*afiche*), he continues to expose himself to satirical thrusts by insisting on publishing (*admonêter*). His greatest adversary is good sense (*adversaire*). He has no equal in abusing the French language (*afectionner*). He speaks like an

¹ The total number of remarks is nearly 1200. Richelet mentions about 500 individuals only once, and slightly fewer than 100 are spoken of twice. Those to whom 3 allusions are made number 50, whereas those included 4 times are only about 25. Approximately 70 personages are spoken of 5 or more times. There are 11 allusions to Port Royal, 12 to Jansenius and Jansenism, and 19 to the French Academy. The remarks about people mentioned 5 times or more number 850. There is not an equal number of instances of personal allusion and of remarks since many of the latter contain references to two or more individuals. There are about 1600 allusions in the 1200 remarks.

² Curiously enough no mention is made of him in the first edition of 1679-80. He is included for the first time in the revised and expanded edition of Cologne, Jean François Gaillard, 1694, and the posthumous editions of Rouen, Le Boucher, 1719, and Paris, Barbou, 1730.

Allobrogian and thinks like an Ostrogoth (*Allobroge*). An examination of his poetry will reveal neither common sense nor French (*anatomiser, animal, aspiration*). Only a part of his strange ways would fill a notebook (*agenda*). His sanity has apparently been disturbed by his efforts in poetry (*alambiquer, armet*) for his imagination is filled with chimeras (*aler*). If the occupational hazard of poets is poverty, Thomas has nothing to fear in that direction (*âge*) in spite of the fact that his lot is no better than that of the hod carrier (*aide à maçon*). Good name and fame will never be his (*s'agrandir*). His works are easily obtained since no one will purchase them from the shops (*aisement*). It must be that he writes his poetry for penance (*ami*) and to provide wrapping paper for the grocers (*à moins que de, vers*). The *beurrières de Lyon* have obtained cheap wrapping for their wares by purchasing his works and the publisher is quite satisfied with the transaction (*s'apprécier, beurrière, rame*). He is decried even in Grenoble, his home (*ânerie*). A splendid play has just been announced: *Thomas de Lormes ou Marsias écorché par les Muses* (*anoncer*). His method of writing is obscure (*amphibologie*). He is truly apocryphal (*apocriphe*), a fool and a rogue (*archifou, fricasser*). He is a great stylist (*arrondisseur*), who has his own manner of writing (*aucunement*) that would inspire attack by Boileau (*s'aplaudir*). There is no one in the kingdom who deserves to be more thoroughly denounced (*autant, camouflet*). For Richelet, he is a *cancre* (*vidi*). He is as boring as Lazare Baïf (sic) (*Lazare, tédieux*). He has had his works bound "en veau, et il se fait moquer de lui car c'est un franc veau" (*veau*). In short, "Si l'on voulait définir T. L. on diroit que c'est un animal qui boit et mange, fourbe les dames quand il peut, et fait toujours de méchants vers et de méchante prose, où le bon sens trébuche à chaque page" (*définir*).

The problem of the identity of the much belabored Thomas de Lormes is not new. Richelet's contemporaries sought for information and were rewarded with this answer by Richelet in his *Les Plus Belles Lettres*, fifth edition, pp. 525-6:³

A Monsieur Thomas De Lormes,
Avocat au Parlement de Grenoble.

On répond par de bons offices à ses injures.

J'ai, à la faveur de mes petits Ouvrages, tâché de faire connoître ce que

³ Cf. also Frédéric Lachèvre, *Bibliographie des Recueils Collectifs de*

vous valiez; & par bonheur j'en suis venu à bout. Les gens de Lettres de Province commencent à s'entretenir de votre mérite; & ceux que j'ai l'honneur de voir à Paris, me demandent tous, qui est ce *Monsieur Thomas de Lormes*, dont vous parlez si avantageusement? Ho, ho! leur dis-je d'un air qui témoigne l'estime que j'ai pour vous, c'est un grand Poète, & un grand Orateur, le Malherbe du Dauphiné, & le Patru du Parlement de Grenoble: & pour en être agréablement persuadé, vous n'avez qu'à lire ses Œuvres. C'est, Monsieur, de la manière que je satisfais la curiosité des Personnes Illustres qui veulent avoir plus de connoissance de ce que vous valez; & vous me devriez sçavoir quelque gré d'une conduite si obligeante. Mais au contraire, vous jetez feu & flâme, & vous me déchirez par de si misérables satires, que si l'on ne voyoit votre nom au bas, on penseroit qu'elles fussent de ces barbouilleurs, qui depuis la Serre, ont été en France. Hé! Monsieur, ne détruisez point par de méchantes pièces la réputation où vous êtes. C'est un bien fragile que cette réputation; & elle vous doit être d'autant plus chère, qu'elle vous coûte infiniment. Travaillez, je vous en conjure, avec esprit, ou demeurez en repos; & faites-moi la grace de croire que rien ne m'empêchera de continuer avec ardeur à vous faire voir que je suis de toute mon âme,

Votre très-humble
Serviteur, R.

SPIRE PITOU

Marquette University

A NOTE ON DIDEROT AND PATRIOTISM

Not long ago the distinguished scholar, R. R. Palmer,¹ devoted a considerable effort to overthrowing the established idea that the men of the eighteenth century were unpatriotic cosmopolitans. Such correctives to traditional generalizations are salutary, provided they do not fall into the opposite error out of a spirit of contradiction. This the author tries not to do, and with scholarly honesty admits there was perhaps less real nationalism, than a growth of civic consciousness.² He then tries to rescue the import of his findings by pointing out that this type of "nationalism" readily turns into the other (i. e. exclusive) kind.

Poésies, III (1662-1700), Paris, Leclerc, 1904, pp. 505-506 for Richelet's epigrammatic poetry directed at Thomas de Lormes.

¹ "The National Idea in France before the Revolution," *JHI*, I (1940), 95-111.

² Actually, Pierre Hermand had already pointed this out, in his *Idées morales de Diderot*, Paris, 1923, p. 175.

Palmer ignores the mountain of conflicting evidence, feeling perhaps that he is not called upon to prove the opposite of his thesis. And yet the contrary evidence shows that the "civic consciousness" type of patriotism may not only grow into the modern feeling of nationalism (a conclusion it contains only implicitly); actually, it reveals quite explicitly that "civic consciousness" is equally consistent with anti-nationalism. The co-existence of these two sentiments is clearly seen in Diderot. While a study from the viewpoint of the history of ideas is of value in making us know what people thought, it is also interesting to know how they felt.³ In Diderot's writings we have not only a reasoned theory of patriotism, but also his own intimate feelings.

From the purely intellectual viewpoint, patriotism for Diderot was a truly civic concept, and an integral part of his system of ethics. It was one phase of humanitarianism;⁴ it was one aspect of his idea of virtue as a selfishly intelligent sacrifice of particular interest for the general interest.⁵ Nowhere was this clearer than in his support of compulsory inoculation.⁶ Patriotism is what the legislator must at all costs implant and nourish: "le législateur . . . doit se proposer de changer l'esprit de propriété en esprit de communauté . . . tous marchent ensemble et contents vers le bien commun; l'amour de la patrie . . . élève l'âme au-dessus des petits intérêts. . ."⁷ But in the same article, Diderot also writes: "Tous les peuples ont aujourd'hui des idées assez justes de leurs voisins, et par conséquent ils ont moins que dans les temps d'ignorance l'enthousiasme de la patrie."⁸ He has but a poor opinion of those "têtes étroites" who think primarily of the interest of their own country rather than of humanity as a whole. "Ces hommes veulent

³ For a general study of nationalism in the 18th c., see Hans Kohn: *The Idea of Nationalism*, N. Y., 1944, ch. v; also L. Ducros: *Les Encyclopédistes*, Paris, 1900. Of some value, Aubertin: *L'Esprit public au 18e siècle*, Paris, 1889; G. Maugras: *Trois mois à la cour de Frédéric II*, Paris, 1886, p. 3-4. Kohn, incidentally, contrary to Palmer, asserts that Rousseau was not a nationalist (p. 245).

⁴ Lanson: "Les Origines de l'esprit philosophique," *RCC.*, xvii², 1901, p. 556.

⁵ Cf. *Lettres à Sophie Volland*, éd. Babelon, Paris, 1930, II, 309.

⁶ *Mémoire sur le calcul des probabilités*, *Œuvres*, éd. Assézat et Tourneux, Paris, 1875, IX, 207-212.

⁷ "Législateur," *Œuvres*, xv, 421-2.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 434.

qu'on les appelle bons citoyens, et j'y consens, pourvu qu'ils me permettent de les appeler méchants hommes."⁹

It is quite clear that in Diderot's mind, the idea of patriotism not only is not associated with that of nationalism, but excludes it. The opposition is definite between "amour de la patrie" and "enthousiasme de la patrie." The latter he brands as an irrational impulse, stemming from passion, not knowledge. Love your country, yes, but as a family of men working together, part of a still larger family. This was very far from the abstract, semi-mystical concept of State or Nation that sprung from Revolution and Romanticism and demanded a man's exclusive loyalty. Here was a higher loyalty.

The "esprit de communauté," in Diderot's concept, is a matter of intelligent persuasion as much as—if not more than—an emotion. The key to patriotism, in the modern sense of nationalism, lies in *feeling*—an irrational, and in its vilest form, an anti-rational feeling. An examination of Diderot's writings, and especially of his correspondence, reveals that Diderot felt no real patriotism. The humiliating succession of French defeats made no impression on him and aroused no animosity toward the English.¹⁰ His feelings towards his country—on those rare occasions when country, as such, entered his mind—were determined by his personal prejudices and experiences, especially the trials he had endured with the publication of the *Encyclopédie*.¹¹ France had persecuted him, and Russia had offered a helping hand. Which were the barbarians? When the Russian government flirted with the idea of sponsoring a new encyclopedia, Diderot embraced the suggestion enthusiastically, savoring the prospect of avenging himself on his country for his

⁹ Diderot emphasized this again in a letter to Hume (22 fév. 1768): "Et que m'importe qu'un homme soit né en deça ou au-delà d'un étroit? . . . Vous servirez votre espèce en général, ce qui est bien plus digne de vous que de n'en servir qu'une bien petite portion." (L. Cru: *Diderot as a Disciple of English Thought*, N. Y., 1913, pp. 467-8). Also (*ibid.*, pp. 466-7): "Ne verrons-nous jamais finir ces aversions nationales . . . ? Je me flatte d'être, comme vous, citoyen de la grande ville du monde." A specific application of this belief came when Diderot condemned critics who attacked the *Encyclopédie* for revealing secrets of the national economy. (*Œuvres*, XIV, 492-3).

¹⁰ *Lettres à Sophie Volland*, éd. Babelon, I, 297; II, 297.

¹¹ *Op. cit.*, II, 191 (3 octobre 1762).

torments.¹² And later, Catherine, in a very material way, was good to him; consequently he rejoiced with her when she trounced the Turks—"je m'en réjouis comme homme, comme philosophe et comme Russe, car je le suis devenu par l'ingratitude de mon pays et par vos bontés."¹³ Was this just rhetoric? Not entirely. The Russians, when he visited them, had paid homage to his worth and inflated his ego. He had no such recognition in his own country. There is no doubting his sincerity when he writes to Sophie Volland, "Je suis forcé d'avouer à moi-même que j'avais l'âme d'un esclave dans le pays qu'on appelle des hommes libres, et que je me suis trouvé l'âme d'un homme libre dans le pays qu'on appelle des esclaves."¹⁴ Was there also in Diderot's mind the thought of the many manuscripts locked in his desk, the very flower of his genius, that he dared not publish while he lived in his own country?

The only instance of nationalistic feeling I have discovered in Diderot's writings was also the result of a moment of pique (possibly personal) against an English art critic, Daniel Webb, who had the impertinence to ignore French critics and artists in his *Inquiry into the Beauties of Painting*.¹⁵ This isolated outburst has its interest; it shows that any man is capable of nationalism, in the right environment, under pressure well directed towards his ego, even a man who so resolutely opposed it.

But our essential conclusion is not altered. Patriotism, in the partisan sense of devotion to the interests of one's country above those of any other country, was unknown to Diderot. It was a kind of loyalty foreign to his generous emotions and his human

¹² "Je ne vous dissimulerai pas qu'il m'est doux de penser . . . que ces barbares qui s'appellent policés par excellence grinceront les dents . . . et qu'il ne leur restera que la honte de leurs anciennes persécutions." (Lettre à Betzky, 15 juin 1774, *Œuvres*, xx, 64). Was it his country he was thinking of, or the hated government of his country? It is probable that the confusion between the two ideas was one of the elements that prevented a growth of nationalism.

¹³ Letter to Catherine the Great, Sept. 13, 1774, in Grot: *Sept lettres à Catherine II*, p. 514.

¹⁴ Babelon: *op. cit.*, III, 256 (15 juin 1774).

¹⁵ London, 1760. Diderot continues: "Je ne pardonne pas davantage à Hogarth d'avoir dit que l'Ecole française n'avait pas même un médiocre coloriste. Vous en avez menti, monsieur Hogarth; c'est de votre part, ignorance ou platitude. Je sais bien que votre nation a le tic de dédaigner un auteur impartial, qui ose parler de nous avec éloge. . . ." (*Salon de 1765*, *Œuvres*, x, 303).

philosophy. He despised it, and confidently predicted its disappearance from the earth.¹⁶

Of Diderot it can be said, as Galiani wrote of d'Alembert, "Fa moderata stima della sua nazione."¹⁷ He did not have d'Alembert's objectivity; but his prejudices were personal and not mystical. Like his *confrères*, Diderot was a true patriot, one who believed in the duty to conform to the common good, but one who refused to abdicate the autonomy of his reason. We find the same attitude almost everywhere among French thinkers in the 18th century. Condorcet—whose philosophy was a quintessence of the most general currents of thought—made a distinction between "amour de la patrie" and "enthousiasme" that was similar to Diderot's.¹⁸

We, too, must make a distinction. The men of the 18th century were not unpatriotic; they were anti-patriots.

LESTER G. CROCKER

Sweet Briar College

¹⁶ Cf. *Œuvres*, xv, 434-5. "On ne pourrait aujourd'hui, par des . . . artifices politiques, inspirer des haines nationales aussi vives qu'autrefois . . . les peuples . . . trouveront si peu de raison de se préférer à d'autres que, s'ils conservent pour la patrie cet amour qui est le fruit de l'intérêt personnel, ils n'auront plus du moins cet enthousiasme qui est le fruit d'une estime exclusive." This was to result from the interdependence of all nations, their union in a large family, working together.

¹⁷ Fausto Nicolini: *Lettre inédite, RLC.*, x (1930), 748.

¹⁸ "Parmi ces erreurs particulières que l'on suppose être utiles dans chaque nation, quelques auteurs ont placé l'amour de la patrie; les uns pour rendre plus favorable la cause de l'erreur en confondant avec des erreurs un sentiment naturel, nécessaire au maintien de la société; les autres, parce qu'ils ont confondu avec le véritable amour de la patrie, l'orgueil national . . . L'amour de la patrie est donc un sentiment naturel inspiré à la fois par les deux seules causes morales qui agissent sur nous: notre intérêt et notre bienveillance pour les autres. Ce sentiment n'est pas contraire à celui de la bienveillance universelle: Marc-Aurèle disait: "Je préfère ma famille à moi-même, ma patrie à ma famille, et l'univers à ma patrie." . . . L'amour de la patrie, inspiré par ces motifs naturels, est susceptible du même enthousiasme que nos autres sentiments, enthousiasme momentané et aveugle dans la plupart des hommes, mais éclairé et durable dans les grandes âmes." *Œuvres*, éd. Arago-O'Connor, Paris, 1847-49, v, 370-2.

JOHN DONNE AND THE TOWER OF BABEL

For the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, one of the more fascinating legends in the Old Testament was that of the building of the tower of Babel and the consequent confusion of tongues. On the basis of the latter event, philologists worked out a series of language relationships that adumbrated the more scientific findings of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and ethnologists, accepting the Dispersion as an established fact, propounded migratory theories that were subsequently substantiated in part. But the mere idea that historical man, like the Titans of old, had once attempted to storm the palace of God filled men of imagination with inextinguishable wonder and set them to searching for enlightening material in all the archives of antiquity.

The most captivating realization of this aspect of human curiosity is Pieter Breugel the Elder's amazing "Building of Babel," but men of letters were also stirred by the Biblical account and the subsidiary literature about it. In England the references are many. We read in the *Conflict of Conscience* a traditional reason for the erection of the tower,¹ and George Peele gives us another in the *Battle of Alcazar*.² Greene³ uses the height of the tower as a metaphorical contrast, and Spenser's House of Alma, we recall, is made "of thing like to that Ægyptian slime, / Whereof king *Nine* whilome built Babell towre."⁴ Sir Thomas Browne gathers up all the pertinent material in the *Religio Medici*⁵ and the *Pseudodoxia Epidemica*,⁶ and everyone remembers that Milton's best discussion of this event is found in the twelfth book of *Paradise Lost*.

Most of the literary allusions can be immediately glossed by anyone familiar with the literature, but John Donne, as usual, has a passage that causes some trouble. In the *Second Anniversary*, he writes:

¹ Dodsley, *Old English Plays* (London, 1874), vi, 36.

² *Works* (Bullen, London, 1884), i, 238.

³ *Frier Bacon and Frier Bungay*, II, i, 3-4.

⁴ *F. Q.*, II, ix, 21, 6.

⁵ *Works* (Keynes, London, 1928), i, 31, 85.

⁶ III, 153, 215, 275-6.

They who did labour Babels tower to 'erect,
 Might have considered, that for that effect,
 All this whole solid Earth could not allow
 Nor furnish forth materialls enow;
 And that this Center, to raise such a place,
 Was far too little, to have been the Base. (417-22)

With his customary considerate afterthought, he provides us with a short commentary in his Nativity Sermon of 1624. "Onely he can raise a Tower, whose top shall reach to Heaven: The Basis of the highest building is but the Earth."⁷ So we have two objections to Nimrod's project: there is not enough matter in the world for such a tower and the earth is too small for the required foundation. Both of these objections seem to have been original in some degree with Donne.

The notion that the tower would have to be of immense height—four miles says the traditional Isidore;⁸ much higher says the extra-traditional Euty chius⁹—go back to the account of Josephus.¹⁰ But as early as Philo¹¹ and Cyrillus of Alexandria,¹² men doubted whether it could have been possible to complete the tower even if "the gods" had not decided to descend. Sixteenth and seventeenth century commentators, while offering new heights like nine or twenty-seven miles, emphasize, without being specific, the foolishness of the plan. To some of them the idea is so absurd that they accept the story only as allegory.¹³ Calvin, however, comes at Donne's first objection rather directly. "Isti (the Babel Builders) autem quum lapidibus et caemento careant, non tamen dubitant aedificium aggredi quod nubes transcendat."¹⁴ Pererius, the eminent Jesuit, touches the second objection though not in the same way.

⁷ *Sermons* (London, 1640), LXXX, 14.

⁸ *Chronicon*, PL, LXXXII, 1022-3.

⁹ *Annales*, PG, CXI, 919.

¹⁰ *History*, I, 4, 2-3.

¹¹ *De Confusione Linguarum*, xxx, 156.

¹² Existimarunt enim, nescio quo pacto, se ex lateribus et luto turrim, quae ad coelos usque pertingeret aedificare omnino posse. PG, LXIX, 77.

¹³ Paulus ab Eitzen, *Commentarius in Genesin* (Francofurti, 1560), p. 309; J. Mercer, *In Genesin Commentarius* (S. l., 1598), p. 227; G. Musculus, *In Genesim Commentarius* (Basileae, 1600), p. 260; Polycarp Lyser, *Noachus* (Lipsiae, 1605), p. 413; A. Tostatus, *Commentaria in Genesim* (Venetia, 1727), I, 162.

¹⁴ *Commentarius in Genesin, Opera* (Brunsvigae, 1882), xxiii, 164.

Neque enim turris illa usque ad altitudinem quatuor milliarium, adiuncta congruenti crassitudine, & amplitudine eius simulque profunditate fundamentorum, quo scilicet tantae molis pondus sustineretur, ulla hominum opera aut fabricari, aut fabricata tandiu consistere, ac perdurare potuisset.¹⁵

Though both of these objections are similar to Donne's, they are not Donne's objections. Were his ideas original, suggested, perhaps, by previous objections? A survey of available material suggests that they were. It is, consequently, interesting to find objections similar to Donne's in the highly original *Turris Babel* (1679) of Athanasius Kircher. This great Catholic polymath calculates that the tower would have to be 178,672 miles high to reach the moon and that its height at that point would be the radius of the earth multiplied by fifty-two. Its mass, then, would be greater than the mass of the earth. So he doubts whether the tower could have been completed because: 1. There would not be sufficient material in the world to build it; 2. Once the tower got beyond the center of gravity, it would collapse; 3. If it were built at the rate of a mile a week, it would take 3426 years to get it as high as the moon; 4. When it got that high, it would take a draught horse that climbed thirty miles a day more than sixteen years to take a load from the base to the summit.¹⁶

DON CAMERON ALLEN

DIE MUTTER IN ADALBERT STIFTERS WERKEN

"Ich hatte mich daran gewöhnt, die Mutter als das Bild der größten häuslichen Reinheit zu betrachten, als das Bild des Duldens, der Sanftmut, des Ordens und des Bestehens,"¹ so spricht der Freiherr von Risach von seiner Mutter im *Nachsommer*. Und ein paar Zeilen weiter:

¹⁵ *Commentariorum et disputationum in Genesim . . . libri IV* (Lugduni, 1607), II, 489.

¹⁶ *Op. cit.* (Amstelodami, 1679), pp. 37-40. John Milton will subsequently base his doubts on the possibility of erecting the tower on a more orthodox basis. Wretched man! what food / Will he convey up thither to sustain / Himself and his rash Armie, where thin Aire / Above the Clouds will pine his entrails gross, / And famish him of Breath, if not of Bread?

¹ A. Stiffters *gesammelte Werke*. Leipzig, Insel Verlag, 3, 667.

Sie, die nie gefordert hatte, die nie auf sich irgend eine Beziehung gemacht hatte, die geräuschlos immer gegeben hatte, die jedes Schicksal als eine Fügung des Himmels empfangen hatte und die in ruhigem Glauben ihre Kinder der Zukunft anvertraut hatte . . .²

Man kann noch hinzufügen, daß diese Mutter nicht mehr jung ist, daß sie noch die Spuren einer großen Schönheit aufweist, und daß sie keine ungewöhnliche Bildung genossen hat. Damit haben wir den Typus Frau vor uns, die den Helden Stifters zwar das Leben schenkt, aber sie sonst nicht aktiv bildet und beeinflusst. Daß ihre Existenz und ihr Wesen zum Charakter ihrer Kinder beitragen, ist nicht zu bestreiten. Doch hebt der Dichter diesen Einfluß selten hervor. Und doch muß seine eigne Mutter direkte Einwirkung auf Stifters Werden gehabt haben, denn er charakterisiert sie in seinen Briefen als "von meist dichterischem Gefühle" (an Dr. H. Meynert, 16. 11. 1848)³ und als "einen unergründlichen See von Liebe," der den "Sonnenschein ihres Herzens über manchen Teil meiner Schriften geworfen" (an seine Nichte Luise 21. 4. 1855).⁴ Einfach und wenig gebildet war auch sie; und doch erscheint sie uns realer und tatkräftiger als die Mütter seiner Erzählungen.

Stifters Mutter muß auch etwas Herbes an sich gehabt haben, wie wir aus seinen Jugenderinnerungen heraushören. Dagegen sind die Mütter seiner Werke fast stets süße ältliche Frauen, denen die Gatten nachrühmen, daß sie immer treu, gütig und anpassungsfähig waren.

Wenn man nun bedenkt, daß alle anderen Charaktere Stifters, männliche sowie weibliche, ein starkes Eigenleben führen, obwohl sie manchmal bis aufs Äußerste stilisiert sind und zu den Trägern von Ideen werden, so wundert man sich, warum er die Mutter geradezu vernachlässigt hat.

Wie anders hat Keller die Mutter dargestellt! Frau Regula Amrain, des grünen Heinrichs Mutter und die anderen, wie kräftig, wie wirklich und selbständig stehen sie da! — Es ist ja nicht so, daß Stifter alle Frauen unterordnet. Im Gegenteil: Brigitta, Corona, die ältere Gerlint sind Kerngestalten, die den Männern zum mindesten die Wage halten. Und die Mädchen, ob gebildet oder einfach, beweisen Geistes- und Seelenstärke, Freiheit und Tatkraft,

² *Ibid.*, 667.

³ Josef Bindtner, *Adalbert Stifter, sein Leben und sein Werk*, Leipzig 1928, 20.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 20.

die fast an die emanzipierten-Frauen der Jung-Deutschlandepoche heranreichen. Dies gilt auch von den Grossmüttern, welche die Trägerinnen des Dichterischen darstellen, mit dem sie ihre Enkel oft so heftig beeinflussen. (*Haidedorf, Waldbrunnen*). Sogar die Pflegemutter ist ein Individuum, dessen Eigenart dem Leser klargemacht wird, wie im *Hagestolz*.

Einige bedeutende Frauen sind ebenfalls Mütter, so Brigitta und Mathilde (*Nachsommer*). Aber ihre Mutterschaft ist unwichtig ihrer allgemeinen Menschlichkeit gegenüber. Die Erziehung ihrer Kinder wird von Männern geleitet. Manche Mutter wäre wohl eine tätige Erzieherin geworden, hätte sie länger gelebt. Aber Margaritas Mutter, in der *Mappe meines Urgrossvaters*, stirbt, als das Kind erst drei Jahre alt ist.

Doch es gibt Ausnahmen. Die Mutter der Zwei Schwestern, Victoria Rikar, ist eine volle Gestalt mit eigenem Wert. Sie kann sich mitteilen und Gedanken austauschen, ohne zu einer tragischen Persönlichkeit heranzuwachsen wie Corona und Mathilde. Die Verhältnisse liegen wohl hier auch etwas anders, denn ihr Mann ist schwächer als die anderen Männer Stifters, aber schwächer nur im physischen nicht im moralischen Sinne. Im *Witiko* erblicken wir noch einmal solche Frauen: Wentila, die Gattinnen Jugelbachs und Lubomirs; aber man beachtet sie weniger, erfasst, wie man ist, vom grossen historischen Geschehen.

Im Ganzen hat Stifter die Mütter als sympathische wenn auch blasse Figuren gezeichnet. Seltsamerweise hat der Dichter solche Mütter in Relief gestellt, deren Einfluss auf ihre Kinder negativ ist. Da ist zunächst Abdias' Mutter, Esther. Sie ist einfältig, aber schmucksüchtig und will ihrem Knaben ihre eigne Eitelkeit aufbürden. Auf echt orientalische Weise behängt sie Abdias mit Samt, Seide und Juwelen, ja zuweilen mit Mädchenkleidern. Diese erlernte Schmucksucht hilft den erwachsenen Sohn ins Unglück stürzen. Auf nüchternere Art verwöhnt Frau Kneigt ihren Sohn Tiburius (*Waldsteig*), der erst viel später durch die Natur und Liebe geheilt wird. Die negativste Mutter jedoch ist Gertraud, die Gattin des Prokopus. Sie ist eine ungerechte Mutter aus ehelicher Unzufriedenheit. So hasst sie ihren Erstgeborenen. Der Zweitgeborene wendet sich von ihr hinweg zum Vater, obwohl sie ihn vergöttert. Aber sogar hier ist die Rolle der Mutter derjenigen der Frau untergeordnet, denn die eigentliche Tragik besteht ja in dem gegenseitigen Verkennen der Gatten.

Trotz dieser ebenerwähnten Ausnahmen bleibt die mütterliche Figur in Stifters Werken etwas unbefriedigend. Vielleicht nur für uns, die wir gewohnt sind, alle genannten Personen vollständig geformt zu sehen mit all ihren grossen und kleinen Eigenschaften. Für Stifter mag das anders gewesen sein. Denn die Mutter war ihm der Leitstern der Kindheit und drückte dem ganz Kleinen ihren Stempel auf. Die Väter, Oheime, Tanten, ja sogar die Großmütter konnten erst wirksamen Einfluss ausüben, wenn das Kind schon die Sprache beherrschte und selbständig handeln konnte. Vielleicht dachte Stifter auch daran, dass die Erziehung im systematischen Sinne—darum handelt es sich in seinen Werken—erst im sechsten Lebensjahr beginnt, wenn das Kind der Schulung bedarf.

Vielleicht liegt der Grund für seine "Vernachlässigung" der Mutter tiefer. Wir haben gesehen, dass die Mütter nur dann hervorgehoben werden, wenn die Väter tot oder schwach sind. Sonst bleiben sie im Hintergrund, denn sie haben ihre Pflicht schon getan, als der Jüngling und das Mädchen noch kleine Kinder waren. Es wäre dann also nicht Nachlässigkeit, mit der Stifter seine Mutterfiguren gestaltet, sondern eine Art Scheu, sie das tun zu lassen, was der Mann und die Umwelt besser vermögen als sie, nämlich das Erziehen.

HANS JUERGENSEN

The Johns Hopkins University

ETYMOLOGIES OF OLD NORSE PROPER NAMES USED AS POETIC DESIGNATIONS

I. *Puþr*, One of Odin's Names (*Grm.* 46, 3). The gen. form of this name appears as *Punns* in the kenning for 'spear,' viz., *Punns megenáss* (*Lipsmannaflokk*, 3^o; *Sk. B I*, 392), so that for the nom. form *Puþr* we may postulate an earlier form **Punnr*. The etymology of the word is uncertain, but I believe it can reasonably be explained as a variant form of *Pundr*, which is likewise used as a name for Odin.

We may postulate a stem **pun-þ-* with *þ*-extension from the root

pun*-¹ 'stretch, swell,' hence **punþar*, with shift of **p*² > **d* according to Verner's Law, > **pundar* > **pundr*, meaning 'One Swollen with Wrath, The Wrathful God' (cf., with ablaut variation, OE *þindan* 'to swell with wrath': ON *Þund*, the name of a swollen river, *Grm.* 21, 1). The form *þupr* could then be derived likewise from **punþar*, but *without* the shift of **p*² > **d* (punþar* > **punnr* > *þupr*), as a variant form of *þundr*.

I think Gering is right when he says in regard to the form *Þupr* (*Kommentar zu den Liedern der Edda*, I, 211): "... mit dem adj. *þupr* (*punnr*) kann er schwerlich identisch sein." The adjective *punnr* (*þupr*) 'thin' must be derived from a root **punn*- with *-*nn*² (cf. Germ. *dünn*), which was the result of the assimilation of **nv* > **nn* (i. e., **punn-u* < **punv-a* < **punu-*), whereas the proper name **Punnr* > *Þupr* may be equated with *Þundr* from a stem **punþ-* with single *-*n* as this appears in the ablaut variations **þan-* : **þen-s* (Goth. *-þan-jan* : *þin-san*, OE *þin-dan*, etc.). But both words, *Þupr* 'The Wrathful God' and the adjective *þupr* 'thin,' go back to a root denoting the idea of 'stretching out (*thin*), increasing the size, swelling' ('swollen' [with wrath]).

II. *Uþr*, One of Odin's Names (*Grm.* 46, 3). This name occurs as a rime word with *Þupr* in *Grm.* 46, 3. The gen. form of the word is *unns* or *unnar*, which appears both as a proper name and as an appellative in kennings pertaining to war (cf. Sijmons-Gering, *op. cit.*, I, 211). Gering (*ibid.*) does not suggest any etymology for the word ("Die etymologie ist unbekannt . . ."), but since the word is used only with reference to war, I venture to suggest that the name *Uþr* (< **Unnr*) may be derived from a root **wunn-* 'toil, pain, strife' in ablaut relation to **winn-*, as in the ON verb *vinna*, *vann* : *unnum* (< **wunn-um*), *unninn* (< **wunn-an-*). The Goth. verb *ga-winnan* (πάσχειν) means 'to suffer,' and this sense is preserved in poetry likewise in ON *vinna* 'to suffer' > 'toil, labor' (prose). Goth. *wunns** (*wunnim*, II Tim. iii, 11) translates Grk. πᾶθμα 'pain,' and in OHG we have *helli-wunna* 'a fury' alongside the form *helli-winna*. Therefore it seems reasonable to assume that ON *Uþr* (< **Unnr*) could have been derived from **Wunn-ar* meaning 'Strife, Pain, Suffering,' which is a

¹ Cf. the ablaut variation in Goth. *-þan-jan* : ON *þen-ja* 'to stretch out,' and **þen-s-*, with *s*-extension, in Goth. *-þinsan* : OHG *dinsan* 'to stretch.'

² Cf. Falk-Torp, *Norw.-Dän. Etym. Wtb.*, II, 1309, *Tynd*.

sense consonant with its usage in kennings and as a proper name for Odin.

III. *Vip-ofnir, Name of a Cock* (*Fjm.* 18, 1). The difficulty in establishing a satisfactory etymology for this name lies in the second element *-ofnir* — the first element *Vip-* is clear enough (cf. *vípr* 'tree, wood'). There is no evidence that the reading *Vip-ofnir* is incorrect, and therefore all attempts to emendate the form in order to arrive at a plausible etymology (cf. Finnur Jónsson, *Lex. Poet.*², 622^a; Björn M. Ólsen, *Arkiv*, 33, 14) must be considered as unjustifiable. Gering (*op. cit.*, I, 414) says regarding the element *-ofnir*: "*Ofner* ist beiname *Ópens* (Grm. 54⁵) und schlangennamen (Grm. 34⁵), aber dieses wort darf man in dem 2. teile des kompositums schwerlich suchen."

We must keep in mind that the proper name *Ofner* 'Snake' represents a poetic designation for 'a weaving, crawling, coiling animal,' derived from the root *of-*³ as this appears in the past participle form *of-inn* from the verb *vefa* 'to weave' (cf. Lat. *serpens* : *serpō* 'crawl, coil'). There is no reason, however, why the poetic designation *Ofner* should be restricted to the snake. Rather, we may assume that it could be applied to any animal whatsoever of which this basic notion of 'coiling, winding,' etc. was a marked characteristic. When a bird alights upon a tree, he winds his claws about the branch to keep himself from falling. This is just as marked a characteristic of a bird (fowl) as is the 'coiling, winding' movement characteristic of a snake. Now, in *Fjm.* 18, 1 *Vip-ofnir* is the name of the cock that stands on the branches of the tree Mime:

Vipofnir heitir, en hann stendr veþrglasi
 & meipþs kvistum Mima.

It seems, therefore, plausible to assume that the name *Vipofnir* was coined *ad hoc* for this passage as a poetic designation for the animal which 'coils, wraps, winds' his claws about the branches of the 'tree' (*Vip-*), i. e., *Vip-ofnir* = 'Tree Coiler' (cock) just as *Ofnir* = 'Winder, Coiler' (snake).

IV. *Lodd-fáfnir, Name of a Mythical Character* (*Hvm.* 111, 1).

² The form *Ófner* also occurs (cf. the verbal forms *óf* : *ófum* from *vefa*). The form *Ofner* may therefore represent *Ófner* with the shortening of the vowel *ó* > *o* before the two consonants *-fn*.

There can be no doubt that the first element *Lodd-* of this compound is contained in the appellative *lodd-are* 'trickster, Possenreisser' and connected with WGmc *lodd-* (cf. OE *lodd-ere* 'beggar,' MLG *lodd-er* : MHG *lott-er* 'Taugenichts, Gaukler,' NHG *Lotter* [*-bube*] 'vagabond') and that the second element is identical with the name of the famous dragon or snake *Fáfnir*.

The name *Fáfnir* (< **Faðm-nir*) was given to this monster evidently because he guarded the famous treasure in his *embrace* (cf. *faþmr* : OE *fædm* 'bosom, outstretched arms'), i. e., because he lay coiled about the treasure in order to keep it in his possession. But the substantive *faþmr* may also mean 'string, thread' (cf. OHG *fadam* > NHG *Faden* 'string'), as Axel Kock (*Arkiv*, 24, 181 ff.) has pointed out in connection with the passage in the *Rígsþula* (16, 2) where the act of weaving thread is described:

Sat þar kona	sveigþi rokk,
breiddi faþm,	bjó váþar.

Here Kock shows that the phrase *breiddi faþm* does not mean 'she stretched out (*breida* < **braidjan* 'to unfold' : *breidr* 'broad') her arms (*faþm*)' but rather 'she prepared (*breida* < **bi-raiðjan* 'to make ready') the *thread*' or 'she set the *thread* in motion' (*breida* < **bi-ríða*, causative verb, from *ríða* 'to ride').

In the proper name *Lodd-fáfnir* the element *-fáfnir* most likely connotes the idea of 'string, thread' rather than that of 'embrace' as in the simplex *Fáfnir*. If *Lodd-fáfnir* refers to a 'trickster, Gaukler,' the idea of *deception* must be present, and with the idea of deception the notion of *entangling* (with thread, string) is easily connected; compare the proper name *Vaf-þrúð-nir* 'One mighty (*þrúðr* 'strong, powerful') in weaving' (*Vaf-* : *vefa* 'to weave'), i. e., 'One skilful in asking *involved, intricate, deceptive* questions.' Gering's interpretation (*op. cit.*, I, 132) of these two names, *Fáfnir* = "der umschlingende," *Lodd-fáfnir* = "der mit gaukelei umstrickende," seems to me to be correct in that he has differentiated the sense of the word *fáfnir* through the verbs *umschlingen* ('to coil') and *umstricken* ('to entangle'), but he does not explain how the word *fáfnir* in the proper name *Lodd-fáfnir* acquired the sense of 'Entangler,' whereas the simplex form *Fáfnir* means 'Embracer.'

V. *Drøttr*, Name of One of the Sons of *Þráll* (*Rígsþ.* 12, 4). The name *Drøttr* is undoubtedly derived from the root **dratt-* as this occurs in the verb *dratt-a* 'to move slowly, clumsily'; *Drøttr* = 'The Clumsy, Lazy One.' But the question still remains as to the origin of the radical vowel *ø* < **a*. There is no evidence that *Drøttr* represents a substantivized adjective **dratt-w-ar* with *w*-extension (**drattwar* > *drøttr* with *w*-umlaut of *a*). On the other hand, the form *Drøttr*⁴ could very easily represent the substantive *u*-declension (**drattur* > *drøttr*), as an analogical formation after the model of those substantives of the *u*-declension which denoted persons, such as *sunr* : *mōgr* 'son,' *órr* (Goth. *airus*) 'messenger,' *vōttr* 'witness.' In conjunction with this pattern there was also the example of original *u*-stems which did not denote persons but were used as proper names designating qualities characteristic of the appellative, such as **had-ur* > *hōðr* = *Hōðr* 'War' (the treacherous slayer of Balder), and especially the names of animals, such as **mardur* > *mōðr* = *Mōðr* 'Marten,' a very common proper name, and **katt-ur* > *kōttr* 'cat,' which was often used as a nickname (cf. *Þorþr kōttr*). With *Drøttr* : *kōttr* compare the diminutives *drettingr* : *ketlingr* ('kitten'), which were likewise used as nicknames. The *u*-declension of *Drøttr* then evidently brought out the sense of that particular quality ('clumsiness, laziness') characteristic of the thrall.

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT

University of Kansas

⁴ No other case form except the nom. *Drøttr* occurs. The names of these sons of *Þráll* are all given in the nom. case, so that the radical vowel furnishes the only criterion for distinguishing between the *u*- and the *a*-declension. The names *Hreimr*, *Klúrr*, *Lútr* (included in this passage), for which no corresponding appellatives exist and which, therefore, must represent secondary *ad hoc* formations parallel to *Drøttr*, may belong to either the *a*- or the *u*-declension. The name *Drumbr* represents the appellative *drumba* 'a stick of wood' and must therefore represent the *a*-declension of the appellative.

AN UNNOTICED MIDDLE BAVARIAN PROSE VERSION
OF PSEUDO-ARISTOTELIAN PROVERBS

The number of prose versions of the so-called Pseudo-Aristotelian proverbs, known to have been spread chiefly in German-speaking territory, is steadily increasing. The following version, published here the first time, is contained in *Codex Germanicus Monacensis* 4657 of the State Library in Munich. It is a paper manuscript (size 9 x 13 cm., resp. 7 x 11 cm.) of the middle of the fifteenth century. The proverb collection forms the introductory part (fol. 45^v) of *Aristotiles ler an Allexander* (fol. 45^v-61^r), a well known medieval treatise, and is followed by numerous other chapters, containing good advice and admonitions given by Aristotle to his disciple Alexander the Great. The last seven lines of 45^v which connect the collection with the rest of the *ler*, begin as follows: *Furpaß spricht er also Edler vnd guotiger furst· naig dich nit zw vnkewschen wercken· wann eß ist ein aigenschaft der schwein* etc. The apophthegms, written in one column, cover the space of twenty lines; every line has thirty-three letters in the average. They are written in an even, legible hand-writing. No punctuation mark has been used except a period placed slightly above the line (10 times). The scribe uses, however, a rather unusual symbol to designate word division. It resembles the modern quotation marks, lowered rather close to the line, e. g. *hanben* (13), *gewaltigen* (15). He obviously did not follow any definite rule in word division, as is clearly shown by the following examples: *deninem* (16), *wneiplich* (46^r) etc. The text reads as follows:

Dy nachge/chriben ler hat gemacht vnd geschickt Ari/totileß dem groffen künig Allexander O du edler fur/t (1) Du solt wenig reden· (2) vnd haimlich fach nit offenwar machen (3) Du solt fein warhafft (4) vnd nicht leichtfertig noch behendt (5) Ab/chneid den ezoren· (6) vnd pis nit kriegig (7) Behüt dich vor wein (8) Gedenck daß du tödlich pist (9) Du solt fein parmhertzig· (9a) vnd nyemant vbel reden (10) Gelaub nit leichtklich allen Worten· (11) vnd mach dich selber nit vnwissen (12) Deinem feint getraw nit· (13) vmb dein verloren oder verdorben güt solt du nit laid haben (14) So deinē nach/ten vbel czw /tet· daß sol dich nit erfrewen (15) Mit deinem gewaltigen· soltu nit kriegen (16) Dein gehaim soltu nit offenbaren deinem weib noch deinen kinden· wann weiber vnd kind· dye ver/weigen allain· deß fy nit wissen

When comparing this collection with other collections made available by recent research, one will be struck by the similarity between the above proverbs (= D) and those contained in CGM 357 (= C; cf. *PMLA*, LIX, 586). Both versions are part of the same treatise, and both contain the same maxims in the same order and arrangement. The difference in phraseology is rather negligible and concerns only sayings 13 and 16, and the introductory sentence, which is considerably shortened in D. A comparison with C, which owes its existence to the Indersdorfer *Schreiberschule*, will also reveal a slight difference in spelling. In contrast to C, which is a few decades older, D does not show the same predilection for the use of the *y*-symbol; e. g. *haimlich* (2) : *haymlich*; *abschneid* (5) : *abschneyd*; *pis* (6) : *pys*; *laid* (13) : *layd*; *gehaim* (16) : *gehaym*. Moreover, D uses *f*, when C uses *v(u)*, e. g. *leichtfertig* (4) : *leichtuertig*; *feint* (12) : *veindt*. In proverb (4), *w*-spelling takes the place of *b*-spelling (*behendt* : *wehend*), while in proverb (2) the *w* was retained (*offenwar*).

In spite of these differences, it is obvious that both manuscripts, C as well as D, go back to the same original. One might even be inclined to regard D as a copy of C, were it not for the differences apparent in sayings no. 13 and no. 16. Nothing is known as to its provenance. The only clue in this respect is given by the difference in the spelling of the shifted *-k*-sound. While C shows a shifted sound (e. g. *werchen* 240^r), D documents no shift (*werken*). This phenomenon, accompanied by other Bavarian characteristics, would suggest placing its provenance in neighboring districts less noted for the writing of the shift at that period. The most probable place no doubt is Munich, where the Indersdorfer Augustinians owned a house. This assumption is confirmed by the fact that Duke Albrecht of Munich used to show great interest for all writings dealing with Alexander the Great. Such Alexander-manuscripts are known to have been translated for him by Decanus Johannes of Indersdorf, as an entry in MS. CGM 357, fol. 197, tends to show: "*geistliche materi* translated for Duke Albrecht of Bavaria in the year 1437 by Johannes Decanus of Indersdorf" (cf. *Cat. Codd. Manu. Scr. Bibl. Regiae Monacensis*, V, 479). Thus it is beyond any doubt that the above proverb collection is the work of a Munich copyist.

Hunter College

CARL SELMER

KLAR WIE KLÖSSBRÜH'

Klöße are a well-known German dish. The water they have been cooked in would, technically, be *Klössbrühe*. Yet, as it has no further use, it justifies a special name no more than would the water sausages were cooked in. There is no term of the type **Wurstbrühe*. *Fleischbrühe* "bouillon, broth," on the other hand, is a desired product.

The currency of the term *Klössbrühe* is restricted to the idiomatic phrase "klar wie Klössbrüh'." As *Kloss*-water is all but clear, we should expect such a meaning as in English "clear as mud." Yet, on the contrary, the meaning of our phrase is "very clear." All this points in the direction of a folk-etymology.

An analogous phrase, which sheds some light on it, is current in Luxembourg: *kloor wei Konviktszopp*¹ "clear as convent-soup." (*Konvikt* is defined¹ as "von Geistlichen geführtes Pensionat einer höheren Knabenanstalt.") In nearby Treves we find a phrase *klaor wi Konviktskaffi*² "clear as convent coffee." It is also well known that Walther von der Vogelweide, in a short poem, complains about the hospitality of the monks of Tegernsee who treated him to pure water. Thus, it seems that the soups and beverages of convents, at least those offered to boarders, were sarcastically compared to water and held up as examples of "clearness."

Based on the foregoing, I suggest that *Klössbrühe* could be a corruption of **Klösterbrühe*, brought about by later popular etymology, and supported by alliteration in the phrase *klar wie Klössbrühe*. No doubt, the alliteration accounts to no small measure for the currency and stability of the phrase.

PAUL FORCHHEIMER

Columbia University

¹ J. Tockert, "Zur Luxemburgischen Studenten-, Pennäler- und Schulsprache." *Jahrbuch 1933 der Luxemburgischen Sprachgesellschaft*.

² *Trierische Heimat*, nos. 3-4, 1934, p. 44.

REVIEWS

Germany's Stepchildren. By SOLOMON LIPTZIN. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1944. 298 pp.

Germany's stepchildren are her Jews. In this book Professor Liptzin traces the history of Jewish attempts at assimilation from the Enlightenment to the present, as exemplified in the thought of individual German-Jewish intellectuals. The book thus stands on the periphery of literature; only twelve of the odd three dozen figures discussed in it were primarily creative writers; and even these are treated as publicists rather than as men of letters.

Professor Liptzin's thesis is that from the *Aufklärung* through the nineteenth century, German-Jewish intellectuals either tried to escape from their connection with the Jewish race (through intermarriage, assimilation, baptism, social camouflage), or they propounded theories which would enable them to walk the tight-rope of a German-Jewish dualism. The birth of the Zionist movement marks the turning point in Jewish thinking on the subject of assimilation. The nationalist-racial dreams of Moses Hess now become political realities. The triumph of the Nazis and their racial doctrines put a final stop to the assimilationist movement in Germany. It compelled German Jews to awake to the realization that neither assimilation nor the dual life of German and Jew was a solution to the Jewish problem. "Hitler thus put a violent end to the German mirage that has dazzled Jewish eyes since the Age of the Enlightenment and, by dissipating a tragic duality, quickened the tempo of Jewish regeneration." This Jewish regeneration, also called the "Jewish renaissance," "national humanism," "Jewish pan-humanism," is a re-emergence of national-racial-ethnic consciousness, which grew out of Zionism or ran parallel to it.

This thesis Professor Liptzin develops and defends with vigor and skill. That his enthusiasm for the cause should damage his sense of objectivity towards the other side is understandable; but it does lead him into making some "loaded" judgments. Thus he writes: "While the Protestant composer Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy wrote Church music, little suspecting that it would one day be banned in his native Germany as non-Aryan music, his aunts vied with one another in their devotion to Catholicism" (p. 23). The gibe hardly seems justified. After all, if Mendelssohn was a sincere Protestant, or, if in composing Protestant music, he was merely obeying a sincere artistic instinct, why should it make any difference to him that a hundred years later the Nazis would ban his music, even if he could have foreseen this weird event?

This is not a trifling point, but goes to the root of Professor Liptzin's whole argument. A repeated pattern of experience in his book runs as follows: A Jewish intellectual tries the way of assimilation (total or partial) as a solution for the dualism of German and Jew. He apparently expects the Gentiles to be in raptures over the conversion and to welcome him with open arms. He therefore throws himself into the activities of the community with all the vigor and self-confidence of one who "belongs"; only to find that Gentile society is still suspicious and hostile and resentful of the new role he is assuming in its midst. He then becomes bitter and disillusioned, feels that his liberalism was all a mistake and makes good his apostasy by returning to the fold of his ancestral faith. From Heine and Hess to Döblin and Ludwig Lewisohn, the pattern of conduct is the same. One wonders whether the behavior does not reflect more on the Jewish victim than on the un-Christian Gentiles who have caused it? Does it not show that these converts never really believed in the liberal ideals they professed, but merely hoped to use assimilation as a means for gaining material or social advantages for themselves? Job cries to God: "Yea though He slay me, yet will I trust in Him." And Spinoza writes: "He who loves God truly, must not expect that God should return his love." Anyone who abandons his tribal loyalties to embrace the ideals of Plato, Montaigne, Spinoza, Kant and Goethe, should not become disloyal to these ideals because reactionary Gentiles are untrue to them. How much more admirable was the attitude of men like Stefan Zweig, who refused to recant their liberalism in adversity, but preferred the escape through suicide to that of seeking shelter in a tribal temple!

The last chapters of Professor Liptzin's book show how deep is the deterioration in the mental fibre of modern man. These chapters deal with the new conception of the Jewish mission in life, as developed by the adherents of the new Jewish renaissance. In the earlier nineteenth century the myth was current among German-Jewish intellectuals that the Jewish mission was to spread cosmopolitanism, peace, freedom, justice and equality among the nations of the world (cf. p. 36). Thus Jewish liberals could look down with contempt on the nationalist strivings of their Gentile German neighbors. With the rise of Zionism, certain Jewish intellectuals began themselves to yearn for the fleshpots of nationalism. Publicists like Theodor Lessing, Martin Buber, Richard Beer-Hoffmann, Max Brod, Arnold Zweig, Erich Kahler became adherents of this new religion. Unfortunately, by this time it had become painfully obvious that, whatever it may have been originally, nationalism was now a force for evil, especially with its new excrescence of racialism.

In this dilemma the Jewish nationalists hit upon a brilliant solution: *Jewish* nationalism will be different. It will avoid all the weaknesses, excesses, vices of Gentile nationalism. It will stand as a beacon of light, tolerance, co-operation, understanding, self-

sacrifice for humanity. There will be no hatred of other nations, no oppression, no arrogance, no chauvinism. Max Brod, who coined the phrase "national humanism," denied that national self-preservation must lead inevitably to hatred of other nationalities. He felt that perhaps it was the mission of the Jews to cleanse the concept of nationalism from the filth and exaggerations of recent decades. Jews had often furnished examples of unselfish love for other peoples and, should they return to Palestine, would again demonstrate the possibility of a more moral type of nationalism. It is perhaps providential, he muses, that the Jews, upon their return to Palestine, will find the Arabs there; for this will enable them to test the new conception of nationalism immediately (p. 271). It would be unfair to sneer at this nonsense in the light of the hindsight afforded by recent events; but did it need such events to demonstrate the folly of such arrogance?

Inspired by the vision of a Jewish renaissance, the Jewish intellectuals went chauvinist with a vengeance. Thus we find Martin Buber talking of the "dark forces within the [Jewish] soul," condemning "barren intellectualism," confirming the Nazi accusation that the Jews are "an Oriental enclave in the Occident" (p. 260). Or there is Erich Kahler, who finds Judaism superior to Christianity; for "while Christianity regards the sacrifice of Jesus as a past act that brought salvation to all people for all time, Judaism insists on unceasing sacrifice day by day as its mode of living. With justice as its foundation, it strives to rear a marvellous structure of pure brotherly love" (pp. 276-77). Christians, he believes, have an uneasy conscience in the presence of Jews, who do not depend on armies or navies, but pursue justice unceasingly, practice peace on earth, and sacrifice themselves for moral values (p. 277). Hence, if western civilization should perish through war and reaction, the Jews will have the comfort of knowing that they bear no responsibility whatever for the universal catastrophe, and that they maintained to the end their post as sentinels of the higher moral values and their faith in a type of man who was fashioned in the likeness of God (p. 281).

Such thoughts, Professor Liptzin assures us, are "typical" of the contemporary Jewish renaissance. They find parallels in the writings of Ahad Ha'am and Richard Beer-Hoffmann, Martin Buber, Max Brod, Arnold Zweig. One shudders to think what may be in store for a new nation whose intellectuals are capable of such hubris or such self-deception. Is this not the German tragedy all over again?

Though the reviewer is completely unconvinced by Professor Liptzin's thesis, he must commend the author for his clear and skilful presentation of the subject. *Germany's Stepchildren* is a valuable study of the German-Jewish psyche.

No Voice is Wholly Lost. By HARRY SLOCHOWER. New York, Creative Age Press, 1945. xix + 404 pp.

In this book Professor Slochower has made a noble attempt to survey and classify the forces and currents in European and American literature between the two world wars. Like so many students of the contemporary scene, the author is distressed by the bewildering and chaotic multiplicity of tendencies, by the lack of common cultural standards. However, he does seem able to reduce the confusion to some semblance of order. He finds four major traditions in contemporary literature: 1. sceptical, relativist individualism; 2. the belief in an absolute of some sort: either *Blut und Boden* (Slochower calls it "the Antaeus tradition"), or Neo-Thomism, or pure *Geist* (philosophical, aesthetic, aristocratic, democratic); 3. the religion of fascism; 4. a movement towards a communal personality to replace the bankrupt individualism of the last four centuries.

The title indicates the author's own bias towards the latter ideal, which is moreover buttressed with the authority of the Marxian dialectic. Accordingly, liberal individualism is condemned, as fiddling while Rome burns. So is Fascist totalitarianism, though it too had its own brand of communal personality. The hope of the future lies in a "social humanism, which on the basis of Marxian directives, is laboring toward a state which would allow the greatest individual expression within an ordered communality" (xix). The best contemporary literature is groping towards a new ideal of integration, which is the modern equivalent of the medieval salvation. Professor Slochower believes that this ideal will take the form of a dialectical humanism which will allow for an interplay between individual genius and public organization (381). And the outstanding champions of that ideal are André Malraux and the Thomas Mann of the Joseph tetralogy.

A curious feature of this study is that both its hero (Marxist literature) and its villain (Fascist literature) occupy a conspicuously small space in the book. The section on Fascism deals largely with the ideology of the movement, and at that only through the semi-Fascist Spengler. Fascist literature itself is represented only by the aged Hauptmann and Hans Fallada, neither of whom was a Nazi, as Slochower himself realizes. On the other hand writers like Hans Grimm, Paul Ernst, Kolbenheyer, Hans Friedrich Blunck, Hanns Johst are not even mentioned. I am sure that Professor Slochower knows the writings of these men, who were passionately wedded to an ideal of the communal soul and who talk much of freedom and other noble things. Professor Slochower would no doubt point to the slight discrepancy between the noble ideals expressed by these Nazi writers and the reality with which Hitler and Co. presented the world. One wishes he would apply the same yardstick to the Soviet writers.

Professor Slochower's selection of writers for discussion is not altogether satisfactory. If Bernard Shaw is to be treated at all, he surely deserves more than a single page. Carl Zuckmayer is merely mentioned in a footnote; Mauriac, Bernanos, Hermann Hesse, Ernst Wiechert are not mentioned at all.

The first of the many mottos which grace this book is a quotation from George Santayana: "Exiles in this world—and what noble mind from Empedocles down, has not had that feeling?" This suggests that the current mania, shared by our author, for seeing our age as the most complex, most chaotic, most split in the whole history of Western culture, is a slight exaggeration. We now know that the traditional habit of seeing a unity in past eras is highly illusory. For every orthodoxy there has always been at least one heterodoxy. Why should it be any different in our day? Why must every artist today work for the emergence of a communal personality? There will always be room in any society for individualists and "communists," both among the masses and the élite. We can well stand artists like André Gide and John Steinbeck. When we consider the vast mass of published literature today, it speaks well for our cultural integration that it can be reduced to four or even ten major tendencies. This may not be in the interest of the communal personality, but it lends vitality to literature, as a comparison of Professor Slochower's treatment of Russian and non-Russian writers clearly shows.

These are some of the misgivings that the reviewer had with regard to Professor Slochower's book. But he can say sincerely that a careful study of it fills him with admiration for the author's wide reading in the literature and philosophy of our day.

HARRY STEINHAEUER

University of Manitoba

Functional Change in Early English. By DONALD W. LEE. A Dissertation . . . Columbia University. George Banta Publishing Co., Menasha, Wisc., 1948. Pp. xi, 129.

This interesting dissertation is a history of "functional change" or "conversion" from the earliest time the author thinks it was practiced up to 1600.

In the first chapter the author defines the problem of functional change, reviewing earlier discussions of it and attempting to fix its origin. Strictly speaking, conversion is a Modern English phenomenon in word formation whereby one part of speech can be used for another, e. g. a *noun* for a *verb*, with no changes in form, except the inflexional endings. One would *a priori* guess that it

would not arise until the English language was well on its way toward shedding its inflexional endings and tightening up its rules of word order, as these rules often enough are the only arbiters of the meaning, e. g. *take my hand* and *hand me the book*. Still it must have had its roots in Old English and even Germanic Word Formation and the author shows clearly its connections with this inflexional past of the language. In OE, as in other Germanic Dialects, the weak verbs, being new in Germanic, were very frequently formed from nouns and adjectives. Before the i-umlaut period one could form the verb **dōm-ġan* from the noun **dōm-az* or the verb **luf-ōġan* from the noun **luf-ō*. What happened here was that the root-syllable of the nouns was abstracted from the endings and used as a root-syllable of the verbs with the addition of the verbal flexional endings, a process not essentially different from the modern *hand: he hand-s me*. But the i-umlaut played havoc with some of these sets, so that after it OE would have the sets *dōm: dēman*, and *lufu: lufian*, where the root-syllable of the verb of the first class was irretrievably changed, and only the second class retained the similarity in its root-syllable. Now the set *lufu: lufian* would by the usual sound and analogical changes develop into *love: love* in Mod. English, as it seems a perfect example of the modern conversion. Here then we no doubt have already in OE the pattern according to which the Modern English conversion developed, and to bring it home to us the author lists about 230 sets of the type *luve: luvien* from the transitional period between Old and Middle English (the 12th century), sets which all survived during the next two or three centuries so that there can be no question about their influence,—and there were many more that did not survive.

Having established this relationship of the conversion to OE denominative verbs, the author goes on to classify the sets noun: verb according to their meaning into twelve classes which he labels A-L. He finds that these classes persist even during the following centuries of conversion, and that the classes F, G—*to hammer* and *to cloak*—are especially common.

The investigation is not restricted to noun: verbs, it also includes verb: nouns and adjective: noun: verbs. For the verb: nouns, the author similarly scans Old English, where he finds the practice of deriving nouns from verbs much less in evidence (especially when restricted to words with the same root-syllables) than the practice of forming verbs from nouns. Still he finds that whatever verb derivatives there are can be classified according to their meaning into five classes labelled A-E, of which I shall only mention A and C, the nomen actionis: *run*, and the nomen agentis: (*chimney*) *sweep*. In connection with this latter formation, I am surprised that the author nowhere mentions the two common OE ways of forming nomina agentis from verbs, viz. the old Germanic way illustrated by *bēōdan: boda*, *witan: wita*, *flēōtan: flota*, and the later Germanic way, based on the Latin suffix *-arius*, and illustrated in OE by *dōm*,

dēman: *dōmere*, in Mod. English by the very frequent *cut*: *cutter* type. Of course neither of these formations could lead the way to later conversion (though *wita* might have led to *wit* as far as the sound development goes). But there is little doubt that the infrequency of the type *chimney sweep*, noticed but not explained by the author in the 14th century (p. 64), is due to the frequency of the type *sweeper*, at that time and ever after. The omission is all the more remarkable since the author lists other verb: noun sets found in OE such as *riðan*: *rād*, *būgan*: *bēag*, *bēðan*: *bod*, and others that do not have the same root-syllable as the verb, though of course he is most interested in the ones that have the same root-syllable, as being possible ancestors of the later converted verb: nouns.

The four remaining chapters are devoted to the thirteenth, the fourteenth, the fifteenth, and the sixteenth centuries respectively, the author listing all sets of conversions, nouns: verbs, verbs: nouns, adjectives: nouns: verbs, etc., that he could find in the *NED*. In so doing he pays attention to the origin (native, Scandinavian, French, etc.) of the sets, and classifies them according to the A-L, A-E semasiological classes mentioned above. He also summarizes the development within each century, excepting the thirteenth and the fourteenth, which he treats together.

In the preface the author confesses to a sneaking desire to hit back at those educators who would not stand for using *contact* as a verb. And it must be admitted that he has here ammunition for an annihilating blow at these purists. But perhaps the conservative educators could hit back at him with another study, a study of conservation, a study of conflicting types, as the *sweep* and *sweeper* mentioned above, or the *doom*: *deem*: *doomed* that still survives in spite of all conversion.

Still, the author obviously did not set out to do that, but what he wanted to do he has done with thoroughness and distinction, for which we all may be grateful to him.

STEFÁN EINARSSON

The Canterbury Tales of Geoffrey Chaucer. A new modern English prose translation by R. M. LUMIANSKY, published together with the original Middle English text of the General Prologue and the Nun's Priest's Tale. Preface by Mark Van Doren. Illustrated by H. Lawrence Hoffman. New York: Simon and Schuster, [1948]. Pp. xxx + 346.

The wish to make Chaucer more generally accessible to the modern is laudable, and it may be said at once that Mr. Lumiansky's translation is managed in firm, clear prose. One may suppose, however, that almost any change from a great original is bound to

be disappointing, and anyone who really knows Chaucer's verse will think it perhaps better that even the beginner should be sent to the Middle English at once. Of the Squire "he was as joyful as the month of May" is not the same as "He was as freshe as is the month of May"; of the Prioress, "whose smile was very quiet and simple" misses the staccato touch of "ful simple and coy"; of the decoration of the Temple of Mars the "gnarled, knotty, barren trees and sharp, hideous stumps" and the "rushing wind" that made the "gate tremble" miss something of the onomatopoeia of the original. Arcite's "Alas, the great woe and the sharp pains that I have suffered" loses the material and funereal drumbeat of his own lament. Never in the wide world could the Wife of Bath have said "I never made love from expediency"—at least never in just that way. The Clerk's Envoy suffers an almost seasick change in the magnificent passage regarding wives as strong as camels: "don't allow men to do injustices to you" for "Ne suffreth nat that men yow doon offence." In the speech of Sir Thopas "I shall pierce your stomach before nine o'clock, if I can . . ." is rather different from: "'Thy mawe Shal I percen if I may Er it be fully pryme of day. . . .'" The quality and color as well as the rhythm and motion of the original are missing. "Chirking" is a much more mysterious word than "confused cries" will render. "Shode" is the parting of the hair and not the "temple." "Sovereyn prys" is not "valuable loot" but "splendid renown" or even "excellent reputation." A grossly misleading statement is quoted in the introduction: "Setting himself against the weight of medieval authority, Chaucer wrote of English men and women and wrote in the English tongue." The stylized illustrations have a burlesque quality far cruder than Chaucer's humor. One may fear that they may sell the book to Hollywood.

HOWARD R. PATCH

Smith College

BRIEF MENTION

Georg Büchner, Gesammelte Werke; mit einem Lebensbild herausgegeben von CARL SEELIG. Artemis Verlag, Zürich, 1944. 319 pp. Die verschiedenen Büchner-Ausgaben, die in den letzten Jahren auf dem Markt erschienen sind, legen ein beredtes Zeugnis ab für die wachsende Popularität dieses Dichters. Die von Carl Seelig besorgte Neuauflage wendet sich augenscheinlich an dieses breitere Publikum: sie macht keinerlei Ansprüche auf Vollständigkeit oder kritische Verarbeitung des Details; nicht nur die Parlipomena zu den Dichtungen sondern auch die Übersetzungen Büchners aus Hugo sind ausgeschieden worden. Auch die Briefe sind in keiner Weise vollständig wiedergegeben: vor allem eine

ganze Reihe von längeren und kürzeren Briefen an die Familie des Dichters sowie verschiedene Briefe an Gutzkow, deren Ausscheidung am wenigsten einleuchtet, wurden ausgelassen (dagegen finden sich zwei Briefe an die Familie, die z. B. die Bergemannsche Insel-Ausgabe nicht enthält). Durch erläuternde Zwischenbemerkungen wurden die aufgenommenen Briefe immer sehr geschickt zu einer Art Autobiographie des Dichters verarbeitet. Der *Hessische Landbote* erscheint selbstverständlich ungekürzt, aber von Büchners Antrittsvorlesung in Zürich nur die erste Hälfte. Besonders tritt Seeligs Nachwort (unter dem Titel "Lebensbild eines jungen Genies") auf — mit fast 40 Seiten! — in dem das Ende Büchners vielleicht doch ein wenig zu sehr dramatisiert worden ist. Wären kritische Ausgaben unserer Dichter heute anderwärts erhältlich, würde man das Fehlende in der vorliegenden Ausgabe wohl nicht so schmerzlich vermissen. Für das allgemeine Lesepublikum freilich lässt sich schwerlich eine geschmackvollere Ausgabe als die vorliegende denken.

WOLFGANG PAULSEN

Smith College

The World of Learning. Second Edition. London: Europa Publications Ltd., 1948. Pp. xii + 824. 60 s. A great improvement over the first edition (1947), which I reviewed in *MLN*, LXII, 286. Information has been received from so many more institutions that the work has increased to more than half again its original size. Introductory pages about Unesco have been added, and there is now a list of abbreviations. This time the Institute for Advanced Study has found a place, though the names of its professors are not listed. In spite of my protest two years ago, the Collège de France is still placed under "National High Schools and Colleges," and the American Philosophical Society is still entered as if it were composed of professors of philosophy. Evidently the editors are unaware of the fact that, when Benjamin Franklin founded this society in the eighteenth century, he used the word "philosophical" in the sense that was then familiar to the learned world. If the book is to replace *Minerva*, such slips should be avoided, and there should be an index of personal names. Even as it is, the work should be found in all libraries of consequence.

H. C. L.

CORRESPONDENCE

Kanke(r)dort 'A STATE OF SUSPENSE, A DIFFICULT POSITION.' The solution proposed (*MLN* LXIV, 264) by Professor Spargo for the Chaucerian nonce-word *kanke(r)dort* (*Troilus and Criseyde* II, 1752: 'Was Troilus

nought in a *kankedort*,' variant *kankerdort*, the word rhyming with *com-fort* and *sort*), which was to divide the word into *cankered* 'crab-like' and *ort* (*ord*) 'place' (Troilus found himself in a 'region, or area, where crab-like or uncertain behavior prevails,' with allusion to the 'crab-like' movement of the sun during the summer solstice) may be questioned on two grounds:

1. *ord* is never attested in English in the general meaning (extant in German) 'place, area,' only in the original meaning of that Germanic word family 'point' (of weapons), coupled (in the *Beowulf*) with *edge*, or else in the meaning derived from 'point': 'beginning' (coupled with *end*).
2. In order to express the simple idea 'Troilus found himself in a quandary,' Chaucer would not coin such a laborious compound which has no antecedent in the English, or in any, language. The situation requires a direct, graphic, well-established word—whose 'nonce-word' character is only due to *our* lack of information; in other words, *kanke(r)dort* must be rather a hapax than a nonce-word.

I translated the term above with 'quandary,' and I wonder if we could not trace the etymology of *kanke(r)dort* to just this English word. I have shown in the *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* XLII, 405 ff. that *quandary* (*quandorum*, *quondorum*) and *conundrum* (*conimbrum*, *quonundrum*, *quadrundum*) represent one word family which goes back to Fr. *calembredaine* 'nonsense-talk' and *calembour* (originally with final -d as *calembredaine* shows) 'pun,' words which in turn are to be retraced to a compound of OF *bourde* 'idiotic talk' (*embourder* 'to cheat'), from Lat. *bŭrdus* 'mule,' with either *caput* (> Prov. *capbord* 'idiotic') or *quadri* (as in *quadrifurcum* > Fr. *carrefour* 'cross-road,' à *califourchon* 'straddling'). Now E. *quandary* 'a state of suspense' (originally probably 'suspense caused by insidious talk') is first attested about 1580 (Lily) and E. *conundrum* 'puzzle' (originally 'puzzling talk') about 1596 (Nashe, Ben Jonson)—earlier, that is, than Fr. *calembour* (1768) and its dialectal variant *équilbourdie* (1658), but the widespread dialectal area of the *calembredaine* family vouches for a popular Old French stem which, given the idealistic character of Old French literature, has had little chance to be attested. If Chaucer's *kanke(r)dort* can be brought into relationship with this family we would have come upon the earliest example of it in English—which would *par ricochet* imply antedatation also for the corresponding French antecedent. Indeed, why should *kanke(r)dort* in Chaucer not be the oldest attestation—in English!—of Fr. *calembour*(d)? The term would show already with Chaucer some of the numerous phonetic alterations that accompany the transplantation of the word family on English soil: *calembour* > **kanembord* (cf. the parallel development of *calembredaine* > *conimbrum*, with -n- replacing -l- because of the following -m) > **kanemdord* (with the second -d- inducing the first, cf. *quadrundum* < *calembredaine*) > *kankedort* (the second -k- repeating the first), with the variant *kankerdort* (in which the second -r- produces the first, cf. *catterpillar* < Fr. **chatte peleur*). If it should be objected that I take too much liberty with the French word-stem in allowing for such exor-

bitant phonetic alterations, I would remind the reader of the equally violent changes undergone by the parallel *calembredaine* while developing, after many hesitations, either to *conundrum* or to *quandary*, and also of the general linguistic experience, pointed out most convincingly by Karl Jaberg, that jocular terms show a particular phonetic instability (cf. also such Anglo-French words as *skulduggery*, *gilravage* etc.). A word meaning 'puzzle, fix, pun, blunder' is particularly exposed to alteration: the Fr. word family *calembour* (*calembredaine*) itself is, as was shown above, the product of an alteration of the stem *bourd-* by the jocular or pejorative Fr. prefix *cali* in which different stems are merged—and such a blend is semantically justified by the meaning of the family which implies a duality (of possible resolutions, interpretations, etc.), an *amb-iguity*.

With the equation *calembour*(d) > *kanke*(r)*dort*, our hapax is placed in the framework of a thriving, picturesque and jocular word-family which must have been familiar to Chaucer in more than one variant.

LEO SPITZER

REPLY TO PROFESSOR ORSINI. Ricevo l'estratto di una recensione del Prof. Napoleone Orsini al mio volume *Italienische Humanismus*. Circa quanto vi è detto desidero far notare:

1. Presso l'Istituto di Studi di Politica Internazionale, indicato come una istituzione fascista, diresse fino al 1943 una collezione storica Adolfo Omodeo. All'Istituto collaboravano Federigo Chabod (oggi direttore dell'Istituto "Croce"), G. Pepe, A. J. Jemolo, L. Dal Pane ecc.

2. La "Rinascita" era l'organo dell'Istituto di Studi sul Rinascimento, ed era diretta da G. Papini in quanto presidente dell'Istituto stesso. Sulla "Rinascita" pubblicò vari articoli lo stesso prof. Napoleone Orsini; dagli Stati Uniti vi collaborarono J. G. Fucilla e Hans Baron.

3. Il mio vol. citato a p. 353 dal titolo *Il Rinascimento italiano* è una raccolta di testi e documenti riferiti negli originali per esercitazioni universitarie. Oltre la sezione di lettere di Cola di Rienzo, vi sono larghe sezioni di testi sulla vita attiva, sulla vita civile (cfr. p. 149 e sgg.), sulla religiosità del Rinascimento. E. Cola vi è presentato non maestro, ma, se mai, discepolo ideale del Petrarca (p. 24: "Cola sentì in Petrarca un maestro").

4. La religiosità cristiana del Rinascimento avevo, fra l'altro, sostenuto in un saggio del 1938 (*La "dignitas hominis" e la letteratura patristica*), come può vedersi anche dal cenno dell'ultimo volume del *Repertorio* del Prezzolini (sotto la voce *Rinascimento*).

5. Il tema della "vita civile" avevo sottolineato, anche con testi inediti, nel mio volume del 1941 *Filosofi italiani del 400*.

EUGENIO GARIN

University of Florence

*To Help Your Students
Say It In Spanish-Quickly*

FUNK & WAGNALLS ENGLISH-SPANISH CONVERSATIONAL DICTIONARY

By JOHN E. AGUIAR,
University of San Francisco

MORE than a dictionary, this important little reference will be a boon to students and to those planning trips to Spanish speaking countries.

In two sections, Part One lists alphabetically by verbs, and translates, thousands of English sentences, phrases and idiomatic expressions. For instance, if you wanted to ask "Where is such and such a place," you would simply look up the verb "is." You would either find it immediately or know for sure it isn't in the book.

Part Two translates 17,000 English words, showing different meanings and their precise Spanish equivalents. For example the word "get" is listed as: get (arrive); get (attain); get (go for); get (understand) and so forth.

Furthermore, a clear explanation of the pronunciation of Spanish letters supplemented by a phonetic rendition of letters and syllables very different from English, is included. Helpful grammatical notes and several important tenses, plus irregular verb forms, will aid students in composing their own sentences.

John E. Aguiar teaches Spanish at the University of San Francisco. The idea for writing this book grew out of his classroom work where he clearly saw the need for the help this book affords. It's a book your students will welcome, and use over and over again. \$3.00

Send for a copy on approval.

FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY

153 East 24th Street • New York 10, N. Y.



For college classes in Spanish
ROMERA-NAVARRO'S

HISTORIA DE LA LITERATURA ESPAÑOLA

SEGUNDA EDICIÓN
CORREGIDA Y AUMENTADA

Ready for fall classes

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

BOSTON NEW YORK CHICAGO ATLANTA SAN FRANCISCO DALLAS LONDON

LETTERS TO MY SON

By DAGOBERT D. RUNES

HERE is a book that will be given an honored place in the thoughtful man's library by the side of the treasured moral and reflective literature that has become part of our heritage.

Some advance opinions: "Reveals the vast wealth of the author's reading and the volume has many enlightening touches of his own genius."—*Rev. Charles S. Macfarland.*

"Only a man of great learning and great spirit could have written them. The American reading public will be fortunate to have access to these writings."—*Bryn J. Hovde, President, New School for Social Research.*

\$2.75

PHILOSOPHICAL LIBRARY, PUBLISHERS

15 East 40th Street, Dept. 138

New York 16, N. Y.

(Expedite shipment by enclosing remittance with order.)